THE

CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

APRIL, 1825.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE XIII.

(*Continued from p.* 101.)

2. Another character of God's providence is, that it is *wise*. On this it will not be necessary to dwell long, since it is implied in what has already been said, and is, in general, exceedingly obvious. Wherever we turn our eyes—whether to the heavens, to the earth, or to ourselves—we see, at once, the wisdom of our Maker and Preserver. It is strikingly apparent, not only in the original structure of what we behold, but in the wonderful manner in which every process and operation is carried on and continued, and in which the wants of every living thing are consulted, provided for, and supplied—Or if we examine the moral world, the same wisdom is not less conspicuous. Good is brought out of evil, light out of darkness, and order out of confusion. The jarring passions, views, interests, and pursuits of men, are so overruled and directed, as to be made to issue invariably in the accomplishment of the designs of heaven.

3. The providence of God is *powerful*. "He doth according to his will, in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou?" How often do we see the greatest events growing out of the most inconsiderable beginnings, or brought about, by what would have appeared to us, the most inadequate means and instruments? In the striking language of ancient prophecy—"Worm Jacob is made to thresh the mountains, and beat them small, and make the hills as chaff." From what small beginnings did the Christian religion proceed which is now filling the world? How few events have been productive of such great changes, of almost every description, as the Protestant reformation? Yet this reformation was chiefly effected by the instrumentality of an obscure Augustinian monk—for such was Martin Luther, when he commenced the great and glorious work which he was preserved and honoured to accomplish. On the other hand, the best concerted plans, and the most powerful preparations of earthly princes, have been often turned to confusion and destruction, by causes which were overlooked or despised. Whom God will protect, none can injure. Whom God will destroy, none can save. "If God be for us, who can be against us!"

IV. I am now to make a few miscellaneous remarks, chiefly of a practical kind, on the subject before us.

1. You will sometimes, it is probable, meet with a distinction made, between *ordinary* and *extraordinary providences*. By ordinary providences you are to understand those occurrences which take place agreeably to the established laws of na-

ture. By extraordinary providences, miracles are usually intended—This, indeed, is their proper character. It required no more power to make the sun stand still, in the time of Joshua, than it requires to make it rise and set daily. The latter is only ordinary, the former was extraordinary.

Another distinction is sometimes made, between *common* and *special providences.* By common providences are usually understood, such events as we are accustomed to expect and experience, in the established use of means. By special providences, such as seem to take place without means, or in opposition to means, or in a manner different from what usually takes place in similar circumstances. It is a common providence, when health is preserved by wholesome diet, temperance, exercise, and the avoidance of contagion. But when a man lives in health, from day to day and month to month, in the midst of pestilence and death, this is by a special providence. Special providences ought always to be noted with care, and acknowledged with peculiar gratitude to God. But it is presumption to act on the expectation that a special providence will be exercised for our preservation. Such dispensations must be wholly left to the award of a sovereign God. It is only the divine blessing on the ordinary use of means, on which we can lawfully calculate.

2. Sometimes, in God's providential dealings, a crime is, as it were, distinctly written in its punishment —the offender is punished *in kind;* he is taken in his own toils; he is ensnared and corrected, or destroyed, by his own wiles; his "violent dealings come down upon his own pate." Individuals may best judge of this, in regard to the divine dealings with themselves; but it is not often that we should attempt to judge in the case of others—Some strongly marked cases, there may indeed be. But we are taught in Scripture carefully to abstain from all rash judgments, in the way of inferring crime from suffering. This was the error of the friends of holy Job, who were eventually reproved, while he was acquitted. Our Lord pointedly reprehended it, with reference to the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, and those on whom the tower in Siloam fell and slew them. We know not what may be the designs of God, in the particular afflictions or chastisements of our brethren. It may be, that he is intending—what certainly we ought to wish—to prepare them, in the school of adversity, to be partakers, at last, of his special favours.

3. A truly devout Christian will often see remarkable answers to his prayers, in providential occurrences, which relate to himself and others. This we are clearly and impressively taught in scripture, in various places; especially by the apostle James, where he refers to the example of Elijah, and assures us that "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." What the scriptures teach on this subject, Christian experience abundantly confirms. Sometimes the answer to prayer is so distinct, so speedy, and so merciful, as to astonish the believing suppliant—to fill his heart with gratitude, and his lips with praise. We are not, however, to calculate on these speedy, and distinctly marked answers to prayer; but leave it with God, to answer in the time and way which to Him may seem best.

"Still raise for good, the supplicating voice,
But leave to heaven, the measure and the choice."

It is our duty, however, in all cases, to follow our prayers with expectations; to mark their answer, and be thankful for it when it is received.

Hence I remark—

4. Observation on the course of providence, is calculated to make a wise, as well as a pious man. Indeed, the course of providence, is but another name, for the course of human affairs. He who carefully observes what has usually taken place in the affairs of men, may commonly foresee and foretell what, in like cir-

cumstances, will again take place: and he who has a belief in the providence of God, will, of course, attribute all to him; and when special or remarkable providences occur, the finger of God will be seen and acknowledged in them all. It was among the many excellent traits in the character of the father of our country, the illustrious Washington, that he observed, and often acknowledged publickly and distinctly, the special providences of God, which were so often apparent in the early periods of our history as a nation. And I will take this opportunity to remark to you, that history—profane as well as sacred,—incontestably demonstrates, that the frowns of Heaven have often remarkably rested, on those generals and statesmen, who did not acknowledge the providence of God and their dependance on him; and that his smiles have usually attended those who did recognise his providence, and look to him to order their affairs in mercy. But pious Christians, however humble in their lot, will, as they grow in grace, grow especially in their attention to the providence of God, as it relates both to themselves and others. They will learn much, and be comforted greatly by observing it. The remark of the pious Flavel, is worthy of remembrance—"that those who carefully observe favourable providences, shall have such providences to observe."

5. Finally—Remember, my young friends, that a sanctified providence is assured, to all those who truly love and serve God. "We know," says an inspired apostle, "that all things work together for good, to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose." As, therefore, you are now in the morning of life, let it be your first and great concern, to make the God of providence your friend. In this you will find a comfort and a support, which can be derived from no other source. To see a father's hand, in the whole ordering of your lot in life—even in your severest trials and sorest afflictions—what can be so well calculated as this, to sooth and satisfy the mind; to make it rejoice in tribulation, and to give a double relish to the sweets of prosperity itself? Let not a day of life ever pass, in which you do not devoutly and solemnly "commit your way unto God," beseeching him "to direct your path." Implore fervently, the smiles and blessing of God on all the labour of your hands; on all your plans; on all your pursuits; on all in which you engage. Engage in nothing in which you cannot, with humble confidence, look up to God, to be with you and bless you in it. Go to no place, and partake in no amusement, in which you cannot ask for God's presence, protection and blessing, to attend you. This is an excellent rule of action. Keep constantly in mind, that your life is in the hand of God; and endeavour so to live from day to day, that death may not overtake you by surprise; but may be welcomed, whenever sent, as the messenger who is to announce to you, that your Father in heaven demands your presence *there*. Amen.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

RELIQUIÆ EVANGELICÆ.

No. V.

Gen. ii. 17.—"In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Was this threatening strictly and literally fulfilled, when Adam ate the forbidden fruit? If not, how was the truth of God maintained? If it was, what place was left for the work of a Redeemer? These are questions of great moment, which ought to be examined with the utmost seriousness and candour; and in answering them the lights of holy scripture ought to be resorted to, and their guidance followed at every step. Let us proceed thus, and see if we cannot obtain a satisfactory result.

That the threatening contemplated was strictly and literally fulfilled, seems to be plainly asserted by an inspired apostle, Rom. v. 17—"By one man sin entered into the world,

and *death* by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." *Death* was the penalty threatened for sin, and the apostle here declares expressly, that it was inflicted on Adam, and on all his posterity. The whole difficulty then, must lie in determining what was intended by *death*, in the original threatening.

It has often and justly been observed, that the word *death*, in the sacred oracles, has three significations. 1. The loss of the moral image of God, and the full prevalence of sin in the soul. Ephes. ii. 1, "You hath he quickened who were *dead* in trespasses and sins." 1 John iii. 14, "He that loveth not his brother abideth in *death*." 2. For the separation of soul and body. Heb. ix. 27, "It is appointed unto all men once to *die*, but after this the judgment." 3. For the everlasting destruction of soul and body in hell. Rom. vi. 23, "The wages of sin is *death*." James i. 15, "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth *death*." Rev. xx. 14, "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire: This is the second *death*." These several kinds of death, have usually and properly been denominated *spiritual*, *temporal* and *eternal* death. Now, if any one of the three was inflicted upon Adam, immediately after the fall, the threatening, according to the language in which it is expressed, was strictly and literally executed—*Death* was the penalty, and *death*, on this supposition, was suffered. But spiritual death was immediately inflicted. On the very day that Adam transgressed, he completely lost the moral image of his Maker. He became, in all his moral constitution, sinful and depraved. This is admitted by all, except by those who altogther deny the native depravity of man. If nothing more than this, therefore, had been inflicted on Adam, he would have suffered, strictly and literally, the penalty of *death*. But far more was inflicted. *Death*, in the second sense of the term as used in scripture, was also incurred. The expression, "thou shalt surely die," is more literally rendered in the margin of our Bibles, "dying thou shalt die"—as is well known to all who understand the original Hebrew words מות תמות. That is, thou shall then *begin* to die, and *death* shall certainly *ensue*. The day on which Adam ate the forbidden fruit this did take place. He lost his immortality—He became mortal. The seeds of death were implanted in him, as they have ever since been in all his offspring. Human life, since the fall of Adam, has been but a *disease*, ending in *certain* death. In addition to all, *death*, in the third sense of the term—eternal death—*began* to be inflicted: and let it be well observed that this, as we have just shown, was all that the threatening, strictly and literally taken, intimated. Eternal death, as well as eternal life, is always commenced on this side the grave. But although commenced, it may be, and happily sometimes is, arrested in its progress. An overwhelming sense of guilt and shame, remorse and horror of conscience, tormenting fear of evil to come, the pain arising from disordered, unhallowed, and disappointed desires and passions,—these are often the beginnings of *endless* misery, which are commenced in the present life; and which appear to have actually commenced in the bosom of our unhappy first parents, immediately after their fall.

Thus, then, we see, that *spiritual death*, which was the parent or productive cause, both of *temporal* and *eternal* death, actually and fully took place on the very day that Adam and Eve ate the forbidden fruit; and that the other kinds of death also, then began to be inflicted on them. We have seen too, it is believed, that this was the whole that the threatening, as recorded, Gen. ii. 17, implied, in the language in which it there stands; and consequently that it was literally and strictly accomplished. This consequence must, we believe, unavoidably follow, unless it can be shown that our first parents *understood* by the threatening more than is expressed in the Bible—understood that temporal and eternal death would *im-*

mediately, unavoidably, and in *all their extent,* follow their transgression. If this could be made appear, it would invalidate our conclusion. For no doubt the *understanding* of parties, must ever be the rule of construction to a covenant or promise, or when a penalty is in prospect: and in the present case, there is no room to admit the supposition, that there was on the part of Adam any real *misunderstanding;* although there is, I think, much reason to believe that his *knowledge* of what sin and its punishment would be, was necessarily very imperfect. Imperfect knowledge, and positive misunderstanding, are not always the same thing. It is one thing for me *not to know* what a party may do, at whose mercy I may absolutely lie; and another and very different thing to be *assured* that he will punish me personally and to the utmost. Such appears to have been the situation of Adam. Before his fall, he *could* have, indeed, but very imperfect conceptions of sin, death, and punishment. So thought Milton, that great master of the human heart. In his representation of Adam's conversation with Eve before the fall, Adam says—

"So near grows death to life, *whate'er death is,*
Some dreadful thing no doubt; for well thou know'st
God hath pronounc'd it death to taste that tree."

But a greater than Milton is here. The Holy Spirit seems to intimate the same thing, by the name given to the tree which bore the forbidden fruit—"the tree of knowledge of good and evil." By abstaining from this fruit the *knowledge* of good would be enjoyed; by eating of it the *knowledge* of evil would be fatally introduced.* While he remained perfectly holy, Adam could have as little notion of what *sinful feelings* would be, as a blind man has of colours, or a deaf man of musick. "Some dreadful thing no doubt," would fully express his apprehension of it. In a word, his conceptions of what his state and feelings would be after the fall, would be very indefinite and inadequate. Yet he knew *facts* enough, on the testimony of God, to induce him to use all his vigilance, and all his powers, to avoid a fallen state—that "dreadful thing." He knew enough to invest him with a fair and full responsibility. He knew he would lose his Maker's favour and his Maker's image, both for himself and his posterity; he knew that immortality also would be lost; and that a *desert* of, and *exposure* to, endless unhappiness would be incurred. But there is no evidence that he *understood* that God's truth and justice would be violated, if he found out some way of saving fallen man and his posterity from endless misery. Indeed Adam could not but see, that if immediate perdition was inflicted on himself, he could not have a posterity. Yet we have reason to believe that he expected posterity, even in the event of his fall; as otherwise he would not have had the motive, which we believe he had, of saving *them,* as well as himself, from the dreadful consequences of transgression.

What then was the state of Adam's mind after the fall? We answer, it was a state of awful *uncertainty* and *perplexity,* aggravated exceedingly by a sense of guilt and the feelings of remorse. All that the *terms* of the threatening had denounced, had indeed been realized. But he saw that divine justice had demands upon him still, which in some way or other must be satisfied. He knew not *how* they could be satisfied, unless he and his partner in guilt should perish forever. And yet, as he had been given to understand that a posterity was to proceed from him, he might have a glimmering of hope, that in the resources of the Deity, a way might be discovered to save him and our first mother from eternal perdition, in consistency with the full demands of justice.

The result then of our inquiries and reasonings hitherto is this—That

* Scott's Commentary.

all that was contained in the original threatening announced to Adam, if he should be disobedient, was fulfilled to the very letter—That it was not included in the terms of that threatening, nor so understood by the parties, that eternal death in all its extent, should be inflicted personally on Adam and on all his posterity—That what was included and understood was, that eternal death, as well as death spiritual and temporal, would be the proper demerit of disobedience, would be tasted by the disobeying parties, and might in justice be inflicted on them personally—And no intimation was given that it would not be so inflicted; other than might seem to be implied in the circumstance that a posterity was to proceed from Adam even if he fell—That the manner in which fallen man should be treated, was a matter left to be disposed of by a wise, sovereign, and holy God, in any way that would satisfy the demands of his perfect justice—That hence our first parents, after their fall, could not, and did not know exactly, what course their offended Maker would take with them; and were filled with anguish, horror, guilt, shame, the upbraidings of conscience, and dreadful perplexity and forebodings about the issue; and yet were not in a state of unqualified despair—And that, on the whole, the way was left perfectly open, in consistency with the exact truth of the original threatening, for God to satisfy his justice and exercise his mercy, in the provision of a Mediator.

A mediator was provided—a substitute and surety, to take the sinner's place. And it is not easy for us to conceive of the delightful surprise, admiration and astonishment, not only of the guilty progenitors of our race, but of the heavenly angelick host—nor on the other hand, of the disappointment and rage of the tempter and his host—when the plan of perfectly satisfying divine justice, and yet of saving man, was revealed in the first promise, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. How much of the details of that plan was then made known, on earth and in heaven, we cannot exactly say—enough certainly to be the object of faith and hope, through every age, till the advent of the Saviour. But since it has been fully and plainly revealed by its complete accomplishment, we know that the "angels desire to look into these things"—And how should man, who is so deeply interested in them, employ all his powers in meditating upon them! How admirable does the plan of redemption appear, as restoring the ruins of the apostacy? Christ Jesus, the second Adam, has not only averted from his believing people the sentence of eternal death, incurred by the transgression of their first covenant head, but has destroyed in their behalf, the *whole work* of sin and death. His people are delivered from spiritual death, by the power of his Spirit, in regeneration—They are "born again—born of God." A work is commenced in their souls, which will at last be completed in perfect holiness, in the heavenly world. Temporal death is, for them, changed in its character. It is no longer an enemy, but a friend—a blessed "sleep," in which they find a happy termination of all their sins and all their sorrows. The paradise to which they will be admitted after death, and where there will be no danger of *falling*, is infinitely more glorious than that which Adam lost by his transgression. And the glory which redounds to God, by the union and display of all his attributes, in the plan of saving sinners through the Son of his love, is greater than that which accrues from all his other works.—"Glory to God *in the highest*, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

The foregoing inquiries and reasonings originated from the belief, that the apostle Paul does plainly and positively assert, that the sentence of death pronounced on Adam was executed upon him personally. The object of the discussion has been to show *how this took place*, in con-

sistency with whatever else is revealed in Scripture on this most interesting subject. The writer has endeavoured to maintain all the great truths of our holy religion, in all that he has said. If he has succeeded, may God bless it, and take the glory to himself. If the writer has failed, may his error be forgiven, and the injury to which it might lead be prevented.

LETTERS FROM AN AGED MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL TO HIS SON, ON THE DUTIES OF THE PASTORAL OFFICE.

LETTER XIII.

My dear Timothy—

It is I believe an indulgence usually granted to those who discuss a subject in a series of letters, that they may be less connected in what they say, than those who profess to write systematically. This indulgence, at any rate, I must claim for myself. For although I have had in my mind, from the first, something like a scheme or general outline of what I proposed to communicate to you on ministerial duty; yet I have not taken the pains which I have advised you to take, and commonly take myself, in composing a sermon—to get every thing into its proper place, before beginning to write at large. If I overlook, as I am very apt to do, something of importance, in a particular part of my plan, I shall, if I think of it afterwards, not hesitate to go back, and endeavour to supply the deficiency. This I am about to do in my present letter. After giving you my thoughts on the best method of forming a sermon, it would have been most in order, if before I treated on the importance of an acceptable delivery, I had said what I am now going to say, *on the different ways in which preparation may be made for discoursing in the sacred desk.*

There are three different methods of preparing discourses for the pulpit. 1. Writing fully all that you propose to say. 2. Writing a part, and leaving a part to be supplied without writing. 3. Studying the subject to be discussed, without writing any thing, or very little. We cannot call extemporaneous speaking *preparation*, because the very terms imply *no preparation*, or that which is next to none. Yet on this, as well as the other particulars mentioned, I shall, as I go along, make some remarks.

Which of these methods is the best?—is a question often asked, with not a little earnestness, by theological students and young preachers of the gospel. The inquiry, however, cannot, I apprehend, be properly answered, without a good deal of distinguishing and explaining. We must distinguish between what is best as a *habit*, and what we may and ought to do *occasionally;* what may be most proper for a young minister, and what for one of some considerable standing in the ministry; what may be most adapted to the natural talents of one individual, and what to those of another. I will say a little on each of these particulars; and then make a few remarks on the various methods of preparing publick discourses, referred to in the general question.

No man in the world, my dear son, ought so carefully to guard against a habit of indolence and carelessness in his business, as a minister of the gospel; because there is no other man on earth, whose business is really so important. To be an ambassador of Christ—to bear the messages of God to man, is emphatically "a high calling;" and involves a responsibility that may well awaken all our solicitude. Now, of this "high calling," the most important part of all is *preaching the gospel.* It is in preaching that we professedly and directly deliver our message; we speak as the ambassadors of Christ; and if we speak aright, we say that, and that only, which he has authorized and sent us to deliver in his name. Is this to be done aright by feeble imperfect mortals, without great care, and laborious preparation? On

the Divine assistance and direction we must indeed rely at last, to enable us to acquit ourselves as becomes our office; and no one would inculcate this more earnestly than myself. But I hardly know in what language to speak of the absurdity and wickedness of making this solemn and interesting truth, a plea for indolence and carelessness on our part. It is the most daring and dreadful presumption, instead of a commendable trust in God, to attempt his *special* service, without using all the means in our power, and putting forth our very best efforts, to perform it in a becoming manner. It follows from this, and it is the point which I wish to make prominent, that all ministers of the gospel, and young ministers the most of all, ought *as a habit*, to prepare for the pulpit diligently and laboriously. Let this be fixed, and settled, and kept in mind, in the first place; and if it be so, I verily believe it will go near to answer all the other inquiries. It will at least render it of far less importance *how* they are answered. The man that is in the habit of preparing diligently and laboriously for the service of the sanctuary, will, perhaps, *fall* into that way of doing it, which best suits himself, without a great deal of advice or direction. It may be of some use to him, at the outset, when the habit is to be formed, to tell him in what manner it may commonly be done most advantageously; but his experience will teach him much which he ought to regard more than all the verbal instructions that can be given.

Habitual preparation for the pulpit then, especially with young ministers, must be *laborious* preparation. Without it, be assured, they cannot acquit themselves to their God, to their people, nor to their own consciences, unless their consciences are sadly misguided. Some allowance, I know, must be made—and I would make all that is reasonable—for the different circumstances in which clergymen may be placed, as to the necessity of attending to some worldly concern, for the support of themselves and their families; and as to the frequency of publick services which may be demanded in revivals of religion, and in missionary labours. But after every allowance that ought to be made, the minister of the gospel who does not, especially in youth, spend a good deal of close mental labour, in his *habitual* preparations for preaching, is unfaithful to his people and to his sacred trust: And I speak it considerately when I say, that if he cannot, or will not, as a habit, prepare his publick discourses with some tolerable degree of diligence and labour, he would commonly better leave the pulpit than continue in it.

Do you ask then—is a minister of the gospel never, except in the cases that have been specified, to open his lips in a publick address, without having prepared for it *laboriously?* I answer, by no means. It was for this reason that I took the distinction between what is *habitual*, and what is *occasional*. He ought occasionally to speak with very little preparation, and sometimes when he has not had the opportunity to prepare at all. He ought in fact never to refuse a plain call in Providence to address his fellow men on the concerns of their souls' salvation; and such special calls will occur, more or less frequently, to every man who has been licensed to preach the gospel. But let him prepare laboriously *as a habit*, and he will speak well *occasionally* without such preparation. This is among the reasons why he ought to be a diligent student, and never fail, when it is practicable, to carry "beaten oil" into the sanctuary of the Lord. The habit of doing this, will not fail to give him mental and ministerial furniture in such abundance, and a capacity of arranging it with such facility and speed, that his occasional services, when almost extemporaneous, will often be as acceptable as any other. The mass of his hearers will sometimes even prefer them before his elaborate discourses. But if his habits be not those of a diligent student, and of

one who, as often as possible, prepares for the pulpit with care and labour, he will never be any thing better than a smatterer and a repetitious declaimer. His warmth, and zeal, and readiness, may perhaps give him some currency and popularity at first; but fix him to one place—let him preach for a year or two to the same people—and even the most unlearned of his hearers will find that they have heard, more than once, all that he has to say; and the better informed will not fail to be wearied and disgusted with his sameness or his emptiness. A man who is habitually an extemporaneous speaker, or who makes but hasty and slight preparations for delivering the momentous truths of divine revelation, I certainly hold to be a *trifler* with sacred things.

I perceive that I have in a measure anticipated what I mentioned as a second distinction, namely—what may be most proper for a young minister, and what for one of considerable standing in the ministry. You do not need to be informed that it must be far easier for elderly clergymen, than for young ones, to preach frequently, and without time to make special preparation. Yet this is a consideration that has not half the weight that it ought to have with the mass of a congregation; even when they have called into the pastoral office a man who has received his license to preach within a year. Probably you have made this discovery for yourself before now, without any information from me. It often produces not a little embarrassment; but it should be met with fortitude and resolution, tempered and exercised with much discretion. Every practicable effort should be made to satisfy the people; and pains should be taken to make them sensible of the importance of permitting their young minister to spend many more hours in his study, in the few first years of his ministry, than will afterwards be necessary. Doing this, he should form and fix his plan, and abide by it steadfastly. *He* ought to be sensible, if his people are not, that his real and permanent usefulness in the church of Christ, will greatly depend on his acquiring a fund of knowledge in the early part of life; and of embodying a good deal of it in the discourses which he delivers to them from sabbath to sabbath. And if he actually does this—if his weekly sermons are confessedly able and profitable, his people will, in general, be pleased and satisfied. They will see that he is not idle nor indifferent to their edification; and they will at least *bear* with his arrangements for his own improvement, and for their ultimate advantage—although at the time they may not see the necessity for them. To this plan, therefore, I repeat, he ought strenuously but discreetly to adhere; and a part of it should be, not to undertake more *stated* services, either of preaching or visiting, than will leave him time to make *one* accurate preparation in a week; and ordinarily he should not attempt more—If he does, they will all be flimsy. *One* well digested, instructive, edifying sermon, will cover the imperfections of several of a different character, which he may be called to deliver; or rather this one will give a value to all the rest, which otherwise they would never possess.

As a minister of the gospel advances in life, he should gradually preach more and study less, than he did at an earlier period. The experience he has had and the preparations he has made, will have furnished him with materials that can easily be brought into use, for almost every occasional service; and they will also have given him a facility in sermonizing with accuracy, which perhaps he once thought he should never acquire. But to the end of life he should not lay aside his habits of study, nor of preparing to preach correctly. Rely upon it, when a man ceases to study, and to digest and methodize his thoughts carefully, all his improvement is at an end. Nay, he will gradually lose his previous acquisitions, and will become super-

annuated sooner, by some years, than he would have done, if he had constantly accustomed his mind to some vigorous exercise.

Let us now attend a little to the third thing which I have proposed to notice, which is—what may be most adapted to the natural talents of one individual, and what to another. And here I am prepared to say, at once, that there is no *one* way of preparing to discourse to a religious assembly, which is best for *every man*. We have seen that all ought to be habitually laborious in making preparations. This I hold to be essential, and to admit of no exception. But in what way that labour should be employed—whether in writing all that is to be said, or writing but partially, or studying and arranging a subject carefully in the mind, without writing any thing, or very little—this, I am persuaded, must and ought, in a great degree, to depend on each individual's turn, talents, and early habits of ordering and uttering his thoughts. *In general*, there ought, I am well satisfied, to be a very liberal and constant use of the pen; especially in early life. We rarely know whether we think clearly or not, till we have tried to express our thoughts. If a man, who has a command of language, finds difficulty in expressing his thoughts, it is because he has not conceived them distinctly and strongly; for we always think in words, and our thoughts cannot be said to be fully at our command, till the words which best express them are so likewise. How strikingly is this verified, when we hear a person say, as we sometimes do, "Now you have hit it exactly—That is just what I meant to say, but I failed in expressing it." Such being the fact, the writing down of our thoughts, seems to be the most natural and easy method of giving them a clear and correct expression. It is that method which allows time to deliberate, affords opportunity for selection and revision, and by securing on paper the train of thinking as far as we have proceeded, prevents forgetfulness, and enables us to avoid repetition. Hence the abundant recommendations, which we have so often and so properly heard, of beginning early to compose in our own language; and of endeavouring by much practice to acquire readiness, and a good style in writing. This is also recommended by all those who have written expressly on publick speaking. *Scribendum quam plurimum*, says Cicero; and he declares that such was his own practice. I have, therefore, in a former letter, taken some pains to point out the manner in which a regular discourse is to be studied, and written out at large. And I suppose there is no question, but that a very great majority of young preachers ought to write out in this manner, a considerable number of their first discourses—the more the better; and that in most cases this practice ought to be, in some measure, continued through a great part of one's ministerial life. For myself, I can say that when I had preached for more than five and twenty years, I was in the habit of writing many of my sermons, with quite as much care as I did at first. But after all, I am by no means prepared to say, that this is the best method for every one. Certainly it has not been the method of some very excellent preachers, whom I have known, and now know. Among lawyers and politicians, I could name four or five of the most distinguished speakers that our country has ever produced (three of whom I knew personally) who certainly never did write any thing that was above mediocrity; and two of the three declared, as I have been well informed, that they *could not* write, and would not attempt it. Possibly this was owing to the neglect of early composition. Be this as it may, the facts are unquestionable—They are facts, however, which stand as exceptions to a very general rule. Most men who speak well, can also write well. But the labour of committing to memory what they have written, is such an intolerable burden to some,

and if their own declarations may be taken, so absolutely *impracticable* to a few, that they seem to have no alternative left, if they deliver written discourses, but to read them closely; and this I think a far greater defect than the want of a little accuracy. I have been told that the celebrated Mr. Walker of Edinburgh, whose printed sermons are among the best in our language, used commonly not to write his discourses till after he had preached them; and that then he could put on paper, nearly verbatim, what he had delivered to the people. This I believe, from some experiments I have made myself, is, after some use, perfectly practicable. Yet it is, in reality, only a particular method of composition—the method of getting much arranged and fixed in the mind, before any thing is written down.

On the whole, we must return to the point from which we started—Let a preacher be a diligent student, and a laborious sermonizer; so that he shall constantly bring forth to his people, as a faithful steward of the mysteries of God, things both new and old—let him do this, and let him take that way of doing it which he finds best for himself; the way in which experience has taught him that he can do it with the most effect. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, a man, I am convinced, should write a great deal; if not in the exact form of sermons, yet on points that he is to discuss in his sermons. But if he can do best without ever forming finished discourses on paper, let him do it.

In my next letter, I propose to take up the different methods of pulpit preparation which I mentioned at the beginning of this, and to say a little upon each.—The Lord direct, assist and bless you; make you faithful, and crown your labours with success.

Affectionately adieu,

FROM THE LONDON CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTOR.

PARAPHRASE OF AMOS, v. 8.

"Seek him that maketh the seven stars and Orion, and turneth the shadow of death into the morning."

Oh, there are hours when misery's dart,
Deep in the stricken spirit lies,
And all the feelings of the heart
Are bound in nameless agonies.

When all the terrors of the Lord
Encompass and distress the soul,
Almost they loose the "Silver cord,"
So roughly does their influence roll.

But seek his throne, nor doubt his power,
By whom the starry worlds were named;
His mercy in the gloomiest hour
Visits the spirits he has framed.

'Tis He who death's dark shadow turns
Into the morning's glowing light:
And every faithful follower learns
To trust on everlasting might.

He form'd Orion's beauteous orb,
And fix'd his place till time shall cease:
Oh, let his praise our powers absorb,
Till death shall give our spirits peace.

Then to the Lamb through countless years,
Shall ceaseless songs of glory rise,
And mortal woes, and griefs, and tears,
Shall never cloud the upper skies.

J. P.

Miscellaneous.

No. I.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

The subject of inquiry in this essay, is the *literal* and *original* meaning of the Greek word αιων (eternity), and its cognate αιωνιος (eternal). They are words employed by the Holy Spirit, to express the duration both of the future happiness of the righteous and the future misery of the wicked. On the meaning of these words, therefore, the strength of the motives that enforce all moral duties must very much depend.

The modern Universalist professes to believe that the literal signification of αιων is *age*. I give his proof in his own language: "Homer uses αιων for life, or the age of man." *Iliad*, iv. 478. "Short was his αιων, taken off by the spear of the magnanimous Ajax." *Iliad*, v. 685. "Then may αιων forsake me in your city." *Iliad*, xvi. 458. "When his αιων shall have left him." The author affirms that the word, in the above passages, cannot mean *eternity*, and adds—"I boldly assert that it never has such an extensive signification. The proper sense of αιων is age." Kneeland, also, in his lectures entitled, *Endless Misery Refuted*, affirms that "it must now be admitted that the word αιων DOES not, neither OAN, signify eternity, nor yet endless duration of time. The word signifies literally an age." He admits, indeed, that the word, taken I suppose figuratively, signifies the duration of the world; the ages of the world; the next life; a period, or periodical dispensation of Divine Providence. Now, it is intended in the present discussion to prove, that whilst the word is frequently employed figuratively, in all the significations just noticed, its *proper*, *original*, and *literal* meaning is, not *age*, but *eternity;* and also, that its cognate, αιωνιος, literally signifies, not *during an age*, but *eternal*.

That αιων often means *eternity*, and αιωνιος *eternal*, we first argue from the fact, that by ancient Latin writers, who were also well acquainted with the Greek language, the former word is translated *ævum*, and *æternitas;* and the latter *æternus*. The following is an extract from Leigh's Critica Sacra. "This word (αιων) is translated by Sully and others, sæculum, ætas, annus, and æternitas. Athanasius, Jerome, Hillary, and Ambrose, render αιωνιος, æternus. Chrysostom, speaking of the punishment which is qualified by αιων says, that 'it is a punishment from which they escape not.'* And Theopholact, that it is 'not to be remitted either here or elsewhere, but to be endured both here and elsewhere.'† Cyprian renders it *æternus*. His language is, 'guilty of an *eternal* sin never to be blotted out.'"‡

Such are the authorities given by Leigh. But there is no necessity to rest the decision on these only. In the Vulgate Latin version, the word αιων, is almost constantly rendered *æternus*. So it is likewise by the early Christian Fathers. Jerome, in his Commentary on Matthew xxv. 41, uses the following language: "Let the prudent reader attend to the fact, that the punishments are *eternal*, and the life *perpetual*, that he may thus escape the danger of ruin."§ Tertullian, in his Apology against the Heathen, in allusion to the same passage says, "that the righteous shall enter upon the retribution of *eternal* life, and the wicked shall go into fire *equally* perpetual and durable."‖ Irenæus, that "the fire is *eternal*

* Non effugiunt pænam.

† Non remittitur hic, vel alibi, sed et hic et alibi punctur.

‡ Reus erit æterni peccati, id est, nunquam delendi.

§ Prudens lector attende, quod et supplicia AETERNA sint, et vita perpetua, metum deinceps non habeat ruinarum.

‖ The author of the essay has not quoted the original of these words—doubtless by an oversight, as the quotation omitted is not more to his purpose than those which he has given.—*Editor.*

which my Father has prepared for the devil and his angels."* Again he quotes the text, Matt. xxv. 41, thus—"Depart ye cursed into *eternal* fire, which my Father has prepared for the devil and his angels:† And then adds this comment—"Because intimating that *eternal* fire was not prepared principally for man, but for him who seduced him and caused him to sin.‡ And again, "punishment *not only temporal but eternal.* § Chrysostom in his Latin works, homily xvi. speaking on Matt. xxv. 41, uses this language—"Go," he says, "ye cursed into *eternal* fire."‖

It is quite unnecessary any further to multiply quotations, to prove that the early fathers translated *αιωνιος* by *æternus.* But still it may possibly be urged that *æternus* itself, does not mean *eternal.* Let Latin authorities determine this point. Chrysostom, in his twenty-sixth homily, gives us an opportunity of knowing how he understood the word. He says for him (the devil) *unextinguishable* fire has been prepared.¶ Now fire that is unextinguishable is certainly eternal. Again, Cicero gives us his opinon on the extent of this word's signification.** "As to the universe, in itself mortal, God in himself *eternal*, gives it motion; so the soul, *eternal*, actuates the frail body: For what is always moved is *eternal.*" He then proceeds to show what is always moved.—"For that which produces motion in another, and that also which is actuated by some foreign power, when they cease to move, necessarily cease to exist. Therefore, that only which moves itself, since it never ceases to move both itself and those things which are moved by other things, *this* is the source, this is the *beginning* of motion. But that which is itself a *beginning*, can have no origin: for all other things arose from the *beginning;* itself from nothing. For that which is produced by any thing without itself cannot be a beginning, which, since it never *began* to exist, shall assuredly never cease to exist." With the correctness or incorrectness of Cicero's philosophical opinions we have, in the present inquiry, no concern. But certainly in the passage just cited, this perfect *master* of the Latin language, and prince of orators, most unequivocally teaches us what he understood to be meant by the Latin word *æternus.* It is that which has no beginning, and shall have no end. It militates not at all against our position, that some instances may be cited in which *æternus* does not mean endless duration. We admit that the word is sometimes used figuratively, to denote limited continuance. But a few cases in which the word is taken in a restrictive sense, no more prove that to be its *original* and *proper* signification, than the instances in which the English words *everlasting* and *eternal* are applied to terminable objects, prove that they are limited in their original and proper signification. Who ever attempted to prove that because we read of *eternal* snows, and *everlasting* hills,

* Et ignis autem *aeternus*, quem præparavit Pater meus diabollo et angelis ejus.

† Abite maledicti in ignem *æternum*, quem præparavit Pater meus diabolo et angelis ejus.

‡ Significans quoniam non homini principaliter præparatus est *æternus* ignis, sed ei qui seduxit et offendere fecit hominem. Lib. iv. cap. 25.

§ Pœna non solum temporabilis sed (et) æterna facta. Lib. iv. cap. 47. Item, vide Lib. iv. cap. 45, atque 78, et Lib. v. cap. 27.

‖ Ite dicet, maledicti, in ignem *æternum.*

¶ Illi enim olim præparatus est *inextinguibilis* ille ignis.

** Ut mundum ex quadam parte mortalem, ipse Deus æternus, sic fragile corpus animus sempiternus, movet. Nam quod semper movetur æternum est.—Nam quod autem motum affert alicui, quodque agitatur aliunde, quando finem habet motus, vivendi finem habeat necesse est. Solum igitur quod sese movet—quia nunquam ne movere quidem desinit, quin cæteris quæ moventur—hic fons, hoc principium est movendi. Principio autem nulla est origo, nam ex principio oriuntur omnia; ipsum autem, nulla ex re. Nec enim esset principium quod gigneretur aliunde, quod si numquam oritur, ne occidit quidem unquam.

that the words *eternal, everlasting*, can literally apply to objects of finite duration?

The authority and testimony of Isidorus goes to prove that αιων sometimes expresses eternity. His language is as follows—"Ævum is perpetual duration, having neither beginning nor end, which the Greeks call αιων—αιων is among them put for *age* and for *eternity;* and hence (from αιων) ævum among the Latins is derived.*" Aristotle, in his treatise concerning heaven, heads his ninth chapter thus—"*Heaven Eternal;*"† and instead of αιωνιος, he uses αιδιος.—And this duration he afterwards, in the very same chapter, expresses by αιων. In the beginning of that chapter, likewise, he says, "We therefore affirm, not only that the heaven is but *one*, but that it cannot be many; and that it is moreover *eternal, imperishable, and unproduced.*"‡ And all this he expresses afterwards by αιων.-Thus much to prove that αιων, αιωνιος, and αιδιος, are used in one and the same extent of signification. We shall next prove that αιδιος denotes endless duration—Herocles furnishes us with a passage of the following import. It is demonstrated that the mind cannot be generated, neither can it be liable to corruption; and that it is a being different from the body—"a being *which is of itself eternal.*"§ Here he makes that to be αιδιος which never began to exist, and which shall never decay. Again, the author proceeds—"Nor could that possibly have existed forever which took its origin at any particular time, neither can that admit of corruption which exists *from eternity.*"‖ Here again, any thing to be αιδιος, must never have begun to exist, and must not be subject to dissolution. Our next authority shall be from the classics, relating to the word αιων. Philo employs this language—"In αιων there is nothing past or future, but in its very nature it is *one.*"* This is just such a definition as makes αιων precisely equivalent to our English word *eternity.* To a Being that inhabits eternity in its fullest sense, nothing is past or future.

We have now seen that the Latin word ævum, properly denoting perpetual duration, or something without beginning or end, is taken in precisely the sense of the Greek αιων, and is also derived from it; and that αιων is employed to denote eternity, as well as sometimes for the period of a man's life (Sæculum). Now this is asserting just the thing for which we contend, that it *properly* signifies *eternity*, but that it also is figuratively used to denote the duration of man's life.

An argument may also be drawn from the English words *eternity* and *eternal.* From αιων comes the Latin *ævum*, from *ævum* the Latin adjective would regularly be *æviternus*, but by syncopation it becomes *æternus*, and hence *æternitas*, and our English words *eternity* and *eternal.* Now as these words of our own language, and the Latin from which they immediately spring, in their properest sense denote *endless* duration, and as words derived, naturally lean towards the signification of their roots, without laying an undue stress on derivation, the *presumption* is, that the radical αιων is to be taken in as ample a signification.

The cognate αιδιος, furnishes us another argument. Αιωνιος and αιδιος, are derived from the same root (αιε) *always.* Clemens Alexandrinus and Aristotle teach us that αιων and αιωνιος, are sometimes used in the very same signification with αιδιος. The former commenting on John vi. 40—"And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son,

* Ævum est ætas perpetua, cujus neque initium neque extremitas nascitur; quod Græci αιωνα vocant, quod aliquando apud eos pro sæculo, pro æterno, ponitur; unde et apud Latinos ævum derivatur.

† Ουρανος αιδιος.

‡ Αιδιος, αφθαρτος, ων και αγενητος.

§ Αυτην καθαυτην ουσαν αιδιον.

‖ Εξ αιδιου—Aurea Carmina.

* Εν αιων δε, ουτε παρελελυθεν ουδεν, ουτε μελλει, αλλα μονον εν φυσηκη.

and believeth on him, may have everlasting life," says—"What then is beyond obtaining eternal life?"* For the word αιωνιος in the text, the writer uses αιδιος in the comment. The inference is plain, that in the judgment of Clemens these words mean the same thing. And Clemens, being a Greek writer, certainly knew the proper force of words in his own language. But Aristotle, in his essay concerning Heaven, puts this question beyond all doubt in the following language—"This extent, which includes the duration of each, beyond which there is nothing, is called αιων. And according to this opinion, the duration of every part of heaven, even that duration which includes the *interminable* continuance and *infinitude* of all, is αιων, (derived from αει, and ειναι,) and is surnamed *deathless* and *divine*."† Here αιων is that duration which has *nothing beyond it;* it includes *interminable continuance* and *infinity;* and it is finally *deathless.* The author also notices the coincidence between his definition of the word, and the meaning most naturally to be deduced from its composition and derivation, namely αει, *ever*, and ειναι, *to be*, making the compound literally *ever-being.* Now nothing can surely be *ever-being*, of which it can *ever* be said in truth "it has no being." To deny this, is very much like denying one of the plainest principles of common sense.

Such then is the authority of Aristotle, one of the most distinguished teachers of Philosophy and Language that the world ever saw. How much such authorities ought to be regarded, in opposition to the vapouring assertions of our modern universalists, let every unprejudiced reader decide for himself.—We say *assertions*, for they are able to produce no proof. All the show of proof they present, is nothing but some passages in the classics, in which αιων means *age*, or *lifetime.* But from this fact, how does it necessarily follow that this must be its *proper*, *literal*, or *original* meaning? If it were settled that the word can have but *one* signification, then there might be some connexion between the fact and the consequence which the Universalist draws; but as it is, there is none at all. Let us for a moment look at this kind of reasoning, when applied to other subjects. The Universalist finds some passages in the classics, where αιων must mean *age;* therefore he "*boldly* asserts" that it "cannot mean *eternity*," and that the proper sense of this word is *age.* Take of this reasoning the following fair Parallelisms.—In the *English* classics, sentences are found in which the *inhabitants* of a particular region, are called "*the country.*" Therefore the word *country*, we may "boldly assert," never means *a region*, and that its proper sense is *the inhabitants of a region!* Again: Our *representatives in congress* are sometimes called "*The House.*" Therefore we are "*boldly to assert*" that the word "*House*," never signifies *a dwelling*, but properly *a company of men!*—I beg not to be compelled publickly to prove that such reasoners possess minds eminently stored with the rudiments of logic, or that they are profoundly read in the Greek language.

If the proof of our position be now complete, then in explaining those passages of scripture in which αιων and αιωνιος are found, we have classical usage to support us in giving them an *unlimited* signification, in all cases except those in which sufficient reasons can be assigned, from obvious attending circumstances, for taking them otherwise. *Infinite duration* being their *literal* signification, all other

* Τι παραιτερω του κεκτησθαι ζωην αιδιον υπολειπεται.

† Το γαρ τελος, το περι εχον τον της εκαστου ζωης χρονον, ου μεδεν εξω, κατα Φυσιν αιων εκαστου κεκληται. Κατα τον αυτον, δε και το του παντος ουρανου τελος, και το τον παντων απειρον χρονον, και την απειριαν περιεχον τελος, αιων εστιν, αποτου αει και ειναι, ειληφως επωνομιαν αθανατος και θειος.

Arist. De Cælo, lib. i. cap. 9.

things being equal, is always to be preferred. In a future number, these words shall be examined, as to the extent of their signification in several passages of the Septuagint and the Greek Testament. A. C.

TRAVELS IN EUROPE FOR HEALTH IN 1820. BY AN AMERICAN CLERGYMAN, OF THE SYNOD OF PHILADELPHIA.

Gibraltar, January 20th, 1820.

My dear Friend,—You may possibly suppose, that my not yet having given you any information relative to the state of religion in this place, must be owing to my curiosity being so much occupied about the many strange objects with which I find myself surrounded, as to allow little time or inclination to inquire on the subject. It is not so. Such a procedure would indeed be unpardonable. The very first concern of man upon earth is religion: and I hold it to be the primary object of inquiry, with a traveller, to ascertain if possible its state in the countries he visits. More is to be known of a people, both as it regards their present situation and their future prospects, by knowing their religion, and the hold it has upon them, than from any other item of knowledge concerning them. On religion depends morality, and on morality depends prosperity. It would be easy to demonstrate this position from all history, both sacred and profane. But you have no incredulity on the subject, that calls for any such demonstration. I may therefore go on to my proper business, of detailing to you what I have learned of the religion of the people of Gibraltar. Only I would premise, that my delay has been owing to a wish to possess myself of all the information which my stay here will allow me to obtain, that I may give it to you altogether.

I was in Gibraltar but a very short time, until my attention was attracted to the Spanish chapel, convenient to my hotel, by the almost incessant ringing of its bells. It is a large building, of modern construction, exhibiting nothing remarkable on its exterior. But within, the profusion of ornament, comprehending pictures, crucifixes, gilding, painting, &c. gives a brilliancy and glitter to the whole, that to a stranger is very imposing. This, connected with the full-toned organ, accompanied with fine vocal musick, renders the place very attractive, but to me, much more for the gratification of curiosity and amusement, than the exercise of devotion. It is open at all hours of the day, and every evening there is quite a congregation assembled for evening prayers. If a stranger takes off his hat, it seems to be regarded as no intrusion to go quietly through the house, and look at all its exhibitions; even though he has to wind his way among the kneeling devotees, who may be scattered over the floor—offering their adorations before the pictures of saints or crucifixes, as each one likes best. There are no pews; the floor is quite vacant—except here and there some benches, where those who are disposed may sit, and give themselves to silent meditation. On one of these I have often sat, while my feelings were soothed and softened by the exquisite musick, and while I have wondered at the strange devotion going on around me. Each worshipper, as he enters, crosses or sprinkles himself with the consecrated water, contained in a large marble vase near the door; then goes to the situation preferred, generally before some painting or crucifix; where dropping on his knees, he repeats in a low whisper, his prayers, gazing on the object before him with a countenance of solemnity and awe, as if looking at the very Deity. Some, without any object before them, with closed eyes, seem to be absorbed in silent supplication. If appearances are to be trusted, there is much sincerity and reverence on the minds of many of these Roman Catholick worshippers, that do them credit; and which ought to put to shame, the profane thoughtlessness and levity, that

mark the appearance of many protestants, during their pretended worship: for surely the worship is only pretended, where reverence and sincerity are wanting. The Roman Catholick worship, like the ancient temple service of the Jews, the pomp and ceremony of which it copies, is eminently calculated to affect the senses, while alas! it appears to furnish very little to enlighten the understanding, or to amend the heart. Whether the ringing of the bells is considered by them as belonging to the very matter of worship, I cannot say; but it really appears to me that nothing less will justify the serious annoyance, arising from its frequency and duration. I think, since I have been here, the bells of the chapel have rung nearly equal to the half of every day, putting the different times of their ringing together; besides a great deal at intervals through the night.

From all I have seen, it does appear to me, that the Roman Catholick religion is a most burdensome expense to the people who keep it up. The number of priests to be supported, for the daily and nightly drudgery of the chapel service; the amount of expenditure, to furnish the images and costly paintings, with which the chapel is ornamented; the loss of time, which an attendance on the various devotional exercises through the week necessarily calls for; with a large amount of *etceteras*, must be a grievous drawback on the temporal prosperity of any people, who are subject thereto. I never was so sensible of the greatness of the blessing, in a temporal point of view, conferred on protestant countries by the reformation, as since I have been here. In the town of Sanroque, where poverty and beggary seem to have fixed their abode, every particle of grandeur appears to be monopolized by the church. The town stands on an eminence, and the church occupies the crown of that eminence. To it all the principal streets point. It is large, and its exterior indicates it to be very ancient. It looks indeed like a mouldering ruin. But on stepping into it, the magnificence and grandeur of ornaments strike one with astonishment. The interest of the capital expended in the establishment, added to the annual charge of supporting its service, if expended on bibles and schools, connected with a mode of worship on the sabbath calculated to enlighten the understanding, and impress the conscience with a sense of moral duty; could not fail in a little time, not only to renovate the population, but the whole face of the surrounding country. It would shed an influence on the half desolate vicinity, that would cause it "to blossom abundantly." It would give it "the glory of Lebanon, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon."

There are but two places of protestant worship in Gibraltar. The one is occupied by the chaplain to the garrison, who of course is a member of the established church of England. The other belongs to a small society of Wesleyan Methodists. The chaplain, I am informed, is an excellent fox hunter on the hills of Spain; and a very conspicuous character at a ball, or a masquerade. This information removed from me every disposition to attend on his ministrations on the sabbath. I had therefore no alternative, but either to remain in the tavern, or partake with the methodists. The four sabbaths which I spent on shipboard were without the comforts of social worship. Neither the weather (being very boisterous) nor the state of my health, would allow me to attempt any thing beyond prayer in the cabin. The first sabbath after I arrived here, I felt really anxious to be once more in the house of God, to enjoy its ordinances: and in hopes of something that might edify, I repaired alone to the Methodist Chapel, as their place of worship is here called. It is a small building, but neatly fitted up. I was early in my attendance, and found a reader in the clerk's desk, who read, for about half an hour, lessons out of the scriptures, while the congregation were

assembling. Small as the house is, the collection of worshippers did not quite fill it. About one half of them were soldiers, in full military dress. After singing and prayer, the minister, a plain looking man, in a voice rather monotonous and very inanimate, gave us a plain but edifying sermon, from these words in the 119th Psalm, 'I am a companion of all those that fear thee, and of them that keep thy precepts." The congregation, through the whole of the exercises, were entirely orderly and serious. During the prayers, I heard from some of them an occasional Amen, uttered in a suppressed tone of voice. Except this, there was nothing observed different from an ordinary Presbyterian congregation in the United States, unless it was, perhaps, a little more evidence of solemnity and engaged attention, than I have sometimes witnessed. I need not tell you that the edification, (I do not say *entertainment;* that is a quite different affair) of an attender on public worship, depends very much on the frame of his own mind: ordinarily, a great deal more than on the ability or effort of the minister who officiates. Certainly I have seldom gone to a place of worship under circumstances more calculated to call forth devotional feeling, than on this occasion. I was a stranger, and as it regarded religious society, a lonely stranger. For four sabbaths I had been as an outcast from the house of God; in feeble health, and disappointed in my expectations of deriving benefit from the sea voyage. I had abundant reason to feel like David in the wilderness, banished from the sanctuary. Under such circumstances, the privilege of prayer, and praise, and preaching, with which I could join, ought to have been to me, as I hope it was, like "springs of water in a thirsty land." I had sometimes been present at Methodist worship in my own country, to gratify curiosity. But *this* was the first time, I believe, that I have ever *worshipped* with them. There was no service in the afternoon: but intimation was given that there would be sermon at night. Fearing night exposure, I did not attend. The week succeeding was spent without religious society, or any social worship. The following sabbath, I attended at the Methodist chapel again, and had the same satisfaction. Anxious for something like religious society, I determined to seek an acquaintance with the minister. Without any introduction, as none could be procured, I called upon him in the evening, and showed him a testimonial of my standing. He received me with a Christian courtesy that was very gratifying, and insisted on my preaching for him that evening. I was not hard to persuade; as it was really a desirable thing, after so many silent sabbaths, to be once more employed in declaring the glad tidings of the gospel to perishing men. On coming down from the pulpit, I was accosted by a number of both men and women, without any introduction, and shaken by the hand, with a freedom which I believe characterizes the members of the methodist society generally, and with a friendliness very becoming Christians, every where. I now found myself at once among friends, and friends from whom I have received no small kindness. On the Monday, I dined with the minister, and spent a pleasant afternoon in his house. He resides in a kind of parsonage, a neat little house of several rooms, adjoining the chapel, owned and furnished by the society; including also a library, containing a number of valuable books on general literature, besides divinity. This is certainly an excellent arrangement, particularly on the Methodist rotation plan; which requires their ministers over settled congregations, to alternate with each other. The new minister, coming to a place where he is to reside six months, a year, or two years; if he has a family, finds a house furnished, and books; so that he can devote himself at once to study, and to his pastoral duties—with little cause for interruption from secular con-

cerns. The present incumbent, Mr. R. has been here not quite a year. He appears to be a plain man, without classical acquirements; and what pleases me much, without the controversial captiousness which infects too many of the clerical brethren, I am afraid, in all denominations. During the afternoon, in the course of free conversation, I told him candidly I was a Calvinist; adding, that while I deemed the Calvinist doctrines of high importance in their place, I entertained entire charity for pious Arminians, as adhering to the most essential points of divine truth. He replied, that he was in principle an Arminian; but entertained the same charity towards Calvinists that I did towards Arminians. Here the subject dropped, and has not been since renewed. He is, as may be expected, a great admirer of John Wesley; but admits that he had his imperfections. He allows him to have been too much attached to that supreme authority, which he exercised in the Methodist church. He says Mr. Wesley, to the last, allowed no interference in arranging the whole corps of preachers, on the circuit or elsewhere, as he thought best. And if at any time, refractoriness was manifested on the part of any individual, Mr. Wesley would tell him; "Sir, we can do without you; you may take your saddle-bags and go home."

On the Wednesday following, I dined with the local preacher, at the house of his son, a young man lately married, who fills the place of first clerk in the department of naval stores. The father informed me, that the Methodist society at Gibraltar had originated through his son's labours. From speaking to his acquaintances on the subject of religion, he got to holding prayer meetings and exhorting, and thus a little society was collected; and by and by they obtained pastors sent over from England. This man still continues to occupy the pulpit, on Wednesday evenings. At his pressing invitation, I preached in his stead. And last sabbath evening, I preached again. The novelty of an American preacher, the first that had ever been heard in Gibraltar, filled the little chapel to overflowing. I found myself quite in a novel situation, and felt a little awkward in it. For a strict communion Presbyterian, to be all at once mingling with Methodists, and worshipping with them, seemed like a "Jew keeping company and going unto one of another nation." But I think I have been taught, with Peter, "What God hath cleansed I ought not to call common." If God has not a people among this little society, then I have no skill in the operation of divine grace on the human heart, and in forming the human character.

I have found it a little difficult in preaching, to avoid every thing that might be construed as bearing on the Arminian controversy. This I think could be of no use in my situation; particularly, as I remain here so short a time—and it might do harm. Yet after all my circumspection, my preaching has had so much of a Calvinistic tinge, as to be recognised by two persons who are Calvinists; and I believe the only ones in the place. They have both called upon me, at my lodgings. One is an Independent; a mechanick some years ago from England. He expressed great satisfaction, in having once more heard the good old doctrine, which he had not heard before since he had been in Gibraltar. The other is Dr. P. surgeon of one of the regiments of artillery. I consider it a loss that I have not become acquainted with this man, until so near the time of my leaving the place. As a gentleman of cultivated mind and warm piety, I have been much gratified with him, and equally so with his lady. She is the daughter of an English rector, near London, of the school of Scott and Newton. Being quite Calvinistic in their views, and warmly attached to the church of England, they cannot feel at liberty to unite with the Methodists; and having no other place of worship,

(the publick services of the chaplain of the garrison they hardly consider as worship;) they feel themselves very desolate. Never have I been so sensible of the value of Christianity as a bond of union and a spring of kindly feeling between strangers, so soon as they recognise in each other the relationship which their common Christianity has produced, as since my experience of the friendship of these interesting individuals. I had been advised before leaving home, in prospect of my travels, and as a passport to kindness among strangers in Europe, to become initiated in the Freemason society. What the value of this institution may be to travellers, I do not know; and my prejudices against it on several accounts, I am very sure will never allow me to know. But my lack of knowledge on this subject, I am very confident will never be matter of regret, should I be so happy, in the different places of my sojourn, as to meet with such Christians as I have found here: and I may add, the superiority of Christianity above masonry in the production of kindness towards strangers, is very conspicuous in this respect, that it reaches the female bosom. It excites, and directs, and sanctifies the kindly feelings of this more kindly part of man, which masonry excommunicates from its fellowship. If mankind were generally Christians, in practical compliance with the truly Christian injunction, "owe no man any thing, but to love one another;" Masonry, and every thing else which claims to be a bond of brotherhood in our world of selfishness and discord, would soon be superseded. In that case, the Christian traveller would find a home, and kindred, fathers and mothers, brethren and sisters, wherever he went; with the very large additional enjoyment of a grateful heart that it was so.

I am just on the eve of leaving this place. Whether I shall have time to write again, before the vessel in which I have taken my passage for Messina in the Island of Sicily sails, I do not know. I have yet a few things, which I would wish to communicate. I may find time to put them on paper on shipboard, if not before.

I remain, most affectionately,
Yours, &c.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

No. VI.

GLEANINGS AND HINTS TOWARDS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AUTHENTICITY OF 1 JOHN, v. 7.

"There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one."

"Ex uno codice æque divina hauriri potest fides, atque ex mille: hoc præsertim loco, ubi adamantina versiculorum cohærentia omnem codicum penuriam compensat." *Bengelius, Apparat. Critic.* p. 771.

Mr. Editor,—In No. V. I endeavoured to exhibit, as briefly as I could, the *internal* evidence by which our verse is sustained. On that species of evidence we lay great stress, and justly too. We say with Bengel, in the extract at the head of this paper —and we say it with strong emphasis: "From one codex, faith equally divine can be drawn, as from a thousand: in this place, especially, where the adamantine connexion of the verses compensates for all the penury of manuscripts."

The bishop of Peterborough in one of his lectures has, indeed, advocated this doctrine, "that no internal evidence can prove a passage to be genuine, when external evidence is *decidedly* against it."* But his antagonist, bishop Burgess, in his review of that lecture, has justly observed, what must strike every scholar, that "the external evidence may be *decidedly* against a passage, and yet not *decisively* against it:—it may be so decided by the opponents of the passage, and even admitted to be so by

* Theol. Lect. 27. on the Integrity of the N. Test.

its advocates; and yet not be *decisive* against it: because, *in itself the external evidence* is not sufficient for such a decision."* And I would put it to the candour of every scholar to say, whether we have not the stronger evidence, of the two, on our side. Even admitting it to be a fact that the *external evidence* were *decidedly* against us—it is unquestionably true that the *internal* evidence is *decisively* for us.

It is worth while to observe how our opponents have treated the *internal* evidence. In theory they are strictly correct. They lay decidedly the greatest weight on it. They tell us so in plain terms. But when they come to apply their own theory—even their own sound rules to our verse—they err wofully against the very rules laid down by themselves. I solicit the special attention of the followers and admirers of Griesbach to this point. That very learned critick, in his own *rules*, lays it down as an important position not to be lost sight of, that the *greatest stress* is to be laid on the *internal* evidence; and *next to that*, on the *external*. "*In judicandis lectionibus*, &c." "In judging of various readings,"—(I now quote Griesbach's Rules)—"a respect is to be had in the *first place* to the internal evidence"—"interna eorum bonitas"—"and *secondly*, to the consent of codices, versions, and fathers."† And moreover, in his latest work, in which of course we are to look for his maturest ideas, he makes the investigation of external evidence "a subordinate part of criticism;" and "a secondary means of determining the correct reading of a passage." He makes it, in fact, even to consist in weighing and deciding on the *internal* evidence. "In indagandis et expendendis internis veræ falsæ ve lectionis indiciis."‡ And that eminent critick shows that he can—in certain circumstances—be perfectly consistent with his own rules. In deciding, for instance, on a manuscript, (the codex Paulin. 17,) he takes the *internal* proofs and evidence for his *chief* guide.* There is also a comment on this point from the pen of one of our ablest opponents; to which I beg the attention of those who have rejected our verse, *exclusively* on the ground of *external* evidence; and that evidence too, taken mainly from manuscripts—I mean the comment of Wetstein. It is true he deemed the verse spurious on the testimony of manuscripts chiefly, even while he made the comment to which I allude. But it belongs to his friends to reconcile Wetstein to himself, in this matter. This critick has declared unhesitatingly, that the most ancient existing manuscripts are utterly insufficient to decide on a question of this kind. "Tam multa codicibus, &c." "So many things," says Wetstein, "can be objected to the" (existing) "manuscripts, both Greek and Latin, which weaken and enervate their testimony, *that scarcely any thing certain can be derived from them alone:*" "ut ex illis solis vix quicquam certi confici possit."† And Wetstein has added the weight of his example to this rule. It is a fact well known to scholars, that Wetstein has defended—and successfully defended—the authenticity of the Syriac epistles of Clemens Romanus, on the ground chiefly of *internal evidence;* and that too *against even the silence of the fathers, and the non-existence of Greek manuscripts!!*"‡

Now when the leading criticks in the opposition, have been thus strictly orthodox in laying down the rule, and in applying it to every other thing *except our verse;* on what ground, I pray you, can they possibly be defended, in making our verse the solitary exception? I am sorry to be obliged to bring charges against any

* Vindic. p. xxix.

† Symb. Crit. vol. ii. p. 90, note. And his Proleg. sect. 3, vol. i. of his N. Test.

‡ Comment. Critic. in Nov. Test. p. 4, &c.

* See his Symb. Critic. vol. ii. p. 90, 91, note. See also Burgess's Vind. p. 108.

† Wetst. Proleg. in N. Test. p. 296, edit. Semler. And Burgess, p. xxix.

‡ See Bp. Burgess, p. xxx.

man. But assuredly their own rules and conduct in other cases being evidence, these great men are guilty of inconsistency and *critical heresy!*

In the opinion then of the greatest men against us, (judging from the sound theory and sound part of the practice of Griesbach and Wetstein, above stated,) we ought, in strict justice, to reverse the maxim of the bishop of Peterborough; for the reverse is most certainly the truth—"No *external* evidence can prove a passage to be spurious, when the *internal* evidence is *decidedly*—or I should now say—*decisively* in its favour." Griesbach and Wetstein, and, so far as I know, all the criticks against us, confirm this by theory and by practice, with the single exception of their refusing an application of it to our verse.*

Now I beg our readers to lay this *sentiment* and this *practice* of the foes and of the friends of our verse, by the side of the strong fact that there is no *internal evidence against our verse.* I speak this emphatically.—There is no *internal evidence against our verse*—even the whole of our generous opponents being judges. The whole of the internal marks, even all that goes to constitute the internal evidence—the *mode of thinking*, the *scope*, the peculiar *diction* of the beloved disciple—the *doctrine* in the verse—are all perfectly at one with John in his gospel, and in the rest of this epistle.—And moreover, the opponents of our verse have not only no interval evidence against our verse; but they have no other kind, even of *external* evidence, than that of the existing manuscripts; on which Wetstein has candidly pronounced a sentence—so fatal to our opponents' whole theory: For the fathers and versions will, as we shall see, give strong testimony in our favour.†

And surely it cannot have escaped the attention of the friends of Griesbach and his theory (it has excited the astonishment of his antagonists) that while he has, with his usual industry, collected every item of the *external* evidence (such as it is) against our verse; and has devoted twenty-four pages to it; he has made his escape, as if in fear of consequences, from the consideration of the *internal* evidence. He bestows only *one half page* on it—indeed only "*three words.*"* And in this single meagre paragraph—in his "three words"—he merely sums up in six observations, the whole of the *internal* evidence. He simply names them. He shows neither their merits nor their weakness. And the reader will on inspection perceive, that the only notice which he takes of the arguments, is an exclamation on the fourth head, "speciosum argumentum!" &c.—"Specious argument" this! were it not that the words "*in the earth*" are awanting in the MSS. as well as the words "*in the heaven.*"†

* See Burgess's Vind. Advert. to his 2d edit.

† I mean the versions used in the Western churches, which were less exposed to errors, than the Greek church.

* This is his own introduction: "Tandem tribus verbis attingamus." See his Diatriba on 1 John, v. 7. vol. ii. of his Nov. Test. and end of the volume, p. 24, bottom.

† We have satisfactory evidence that even this is far from being true. Some versions, and some MSS., (such as those used by Facundus,) and many quotations (six out of Facundus) show "ἐν τῇ γῇ," "*in the earth*" remaining. But MSS. and versions, made long after the leaving out of our verse, have gradually, by the hand of transcribers, lost the phrase "*in the earth,*" which most evidently referred to its correspondent one before, "*in the heaven.*"—See Nolan's Inquiry, p. 555—557. In reference to Griesbach's judgment, in his Diatriba, &c. on 1 John, v. 7, I beg leave to refer the reader to Burgess's able exposure: 1st. That his judgment is *precipitate;* 2d. *Partial;* 3d. *Contrary to his own rules;* 4th. *Untenable.* Vind. pp. 87, &c. And in p. 89, the bishop gives us a specimen of Griesbach's "extravagance, vanity, and untruth!" See the paragraph alluded to, in Griesbach, in p. 25, of his Diatrible, last fifteen lines, beginning with "Ego quidem," &c. And Matthäi establishes against him the painful charge of *partiality,* in the process observed by him in the rejection of 1 John, v. 7: and in

And in a question of this kind, it is proper not to omit the opinion of the strength of the *internal* evidence in behalf of our verse—expressed by as able men and criticks as the world has yet seen; such as Mill, Bengel, Ernesti, Matthäi, Horsley, Eugenius. They did admit all the *kind of external* evidence which their opponents brought against the authenticity of the verse, and yet expressed, in strongest terms, their belief in its authenticity. "Tantum abesse"—(says Eugenius the archbishop of Cherson in his letter to Matthäi in A. D. 1781,) "tantum abesse per interpolationem illum versum surrepsisse, ut ne quidem versus octavus, qui sequitur, staret, nisi versus septimus præcederet, de quo agitur."* To these I ought in gratitude to add the following names, who expressed themselves quite as strongly: Pearson, Hammond, Owen, Wallis, Selden, Bull, Stillingfleet, and Grabe. And really, Mr. Editor, when one casts his eyes over the names of these great men—and can single out from them some of the very first of scholars and criticks—some who had spent fifteen years—some twenty—and some, like Mill, thirty years in their researches and commentaries on the New Testament;—and when we hear them teaching with solemnity and force of argument, the authenticity of our verse; we can scarcely refrain from smiling, when we hear these *new names*, (novi homines.) Dr. Carpenter, and Mr. Worsly, talking "*of gross interpolations of the verse:*" "*palpable forgeries;*"†—or from feeling indignant at Griesbach's telling us "of doubtful, and suspected, and trifling arguments:"* or at Porson's strangely forgetting himself, and descending to "the most arbitrary and unbecoming insult over his antagonist, archdeacon Travis:" and exhibiting "feelings" as Burgess justly observes—"which precluded the exercise of temperate and impartial criticism:"† and replying to an argument which he could not overthrow, nor shake off, in this style.—"If Jerome had told us that his Greek MSS. contained the three heavenly witnesses, he would have *told us a notorious falsehood!*"‡ "Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis!" &c.

In the singular discrepancy existing in the opinions of our opponents, relative to the origin of our verse, we can perceive no trifling proof of their incorrectness. We can hardly find two of the same opinion. Each new writer brings a new theory. Father Simon is confident that the verse originated in a Greek scholium. No, says Dr. Marsh, it certainly took its birth from a Latin scholium. Sandius is sure that it was not quoted before the *third* century. Socinus and Erasmus (I am sorry to put Erasmus into such company), are just as sure that it was not quoted before the *fourth* century. Griesbach has no doubt that it was not quoted before the close of the *fifth* century. The Quarterly Review (Review of Burgess, March, 1822,) is confident that every body is wrong, who thinks that it has been quoted before the sixth century.§ The fact is, they are all equally confident—and they are all equally right!

the adoption by him of ὁς instead of θεος, in 1 Tim. iii. 16. In rejecting 1 John, v. 7, observes Matthäi, he sets aside a mass of evidence from many witnesses, and the testimony of nearly the whole Western churches: while he eagerly adopts ὁς instead of θεος, "*who*," instead of "*God*," in 1 Tim. iii. 16, on much fewer, and even false witnesses, "multo paucioribus, et mendacibus testibus." Matthäi nota in 1 Tim. iii. 16; and Burgess's Vind. p. 88.

* See Burgess, p. 56.

† See Dr. Carpenter's Reply to the bishop of Raphœ, p. 415. and Bp. Burgess's Vind. p. 107.

* Griesb. Diatriba.

† See his Lett. to Travis, pp. 404—406, and Burgess, p. 63.

‡ See his Letters, p. 303, and Burgess, p. 43. Travis in the enlarged edition of his letters, has disdained to pay any particular attention to Prof. Porson. He pays attention only to his objections, which are almost entirely copied from Sir Isaac Newton.

§ See Burgess, p. 36. &c.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

Before I proceed to quote from the pages of ecclesiastical writers, I wish here to set down a proof of the authenticity of our verse from the sacred page.—For it seems to me to belong rather to the *external*, than to the *internal* evidence. Our verse is found in a parallel passage of the Holy Bible. And this existence of a parallel passage does seem to me to have the force of a quotation by an inspired hand. For I view the Holy Bible as composed by the Holy Spirit. Men spake and wrote as He moved them. It is as a *whole* his divine composition. With *Him* there is no future time. With *Him* there is no past time. With Him there was no *priority*, nor *posteriority* in the composition of the different parts of the Bible. Every part of the New Testament was equally present before his mind, when he dictated all the parts of the Old Testament;—even as much so as they are now present before Him. Hence is there any absurdity in saying that *by the Holy Spirit* the quotation is made—and made by him in the Old Testament out of the New Testament? For to him it is the same thing—or it is as easy as to take a quotation from the Old into the New Testament. I can see no absurdity in saying then, that our text is quoted in Deuteronomy, vi. 4. in a manner as full and specific as quotations are usually made from the Old into the New Testament. In our common translation the verse is thus rendered. "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." In the Hebrew, the following is the arrangement of the words: "Hear O Israel, Jehovah, our Elohim, Jehovah .... one." It is certain that the term "one" is placed last. And criticks know that there is a pause (the Hebrew *pesik.*) between the last word, *Jehovah*, in the Hebrew text, and the word for *one.* Thus, "Jehovah, our Elohim, Jehovah—one." And this pause is expressed in some accurate copies of the Hebrew Bible by the usual marks for pesik. (see Frey's Heb. Gram. p. 6.) or in other copies by the *literæ majusculæ.* In my copy it is expressed in the latter way.

The true reading, of the text, therefore, is this—"Jehovah, our Elohim, Jehovah—are one." And here there is the distinct enumeration of the divine three. And they "are one." This I call a quotation of our text by the Holy Spirit.*

2. We have *negative external evidence* in favour of our verse. Our opponents cannot produce the authority of MSS. against our text, older than the beginning of the fourth, or the fifth, or even perhaps the sixth century. The Vatican and Alexandrine codices, I believe, are admitted by all to be among the oldest, if not the oldest. And I am not aware that it has been decided whether these codices are to be dated from the fourth, or fifth, or sixth centuries. They are certainly not older than the fourth century. Now, we have evidence of an unquestionable kind, that MSS. of this late date did suffer from the hands of men. Nolan has established this point beyond controversy, in reference to the codices of Eusebius, and those copied from them; namely, the Palestine and Alexandrine codices. Burgess is of opinion, that the MSS. were not mutilated; but that they suffered by the inattentions of transcribers. Now it is well known to the parties on both sides of our question, that, whilst there are no MSS. later than the fourth century, there are only two MSS. existing (namely, A. B. of Burgess, p. 145.) of a date later than the fourth. Woide places them in the fourth century, Wetstein and Mill in the fifth, and Michaelis in the sixth century. There are none of the seventh, none of the eighth, and two of the ninth century (namely,

* The idea which I have here followed out, I took from the learned Pfeiffer and Leusden. See Joh. Laur. Pfeiffer, Dissert. De Æterna Divin. J. Christi, p. 6.—And Leusd. Philol. Hebr. pp. 110. 112. And his Clavis Heb. Vet. Test. p. 116, on the use and meaning of the *literæ majusculæ* in the words used in Deut. vi. 4.

G. g. Burgess, p. 145). All the rest are of a later date.

Now these four MSS. which want our text, can be traced to a corrupted source. Griesbach will not refuse that they are of the Alexandrine or Palestine source. He even advocates that class. And we refer our readers to what we have already established in relation to MSS. of this source.* Hence we can distinctly perceive that the whole materials, whence the *external* evidence against our text is derived, are no older than the fourth century; or in the opinion of Michaelis, no older than the sixth century. Here the opponents of our verse must begin to draw all the matter of their arguments against us. The four, or the six centuries preceding this period, offer them no resources. But we can go back, under the clear light of unquestionable quotations out of Phoebadus, and Cyprian, Tertullian, and the testimony of almost the whole western churches, till we arrive near to the primitive and apostolical times, when the *literæ authenticæ*, or the autographs of the inspired penmen, were in existence in the church. And this distinct testimony existed in the western churches (fully equal in its testimony, nay superior, as we shall see in its place, to the Greek church, in a question of this kind,)—it existed in the western churches for centuries before the defective MSS. of our antagonists had an existence.

There is another branch of *negative external evidence*, which seems to me to merit some notice. *There is not an objection recorded on all the pages of the Greek and Latin fathers against our verse.* In the struggle with the Photinians, not an objection can be found on either side. In the severe and protracted controversy with the Arians, not an objection is recorded against it. It was distinctly quoted on a publick and interesting occasion, by the African bishops in the year 485, against the Arian bishop and his priests, supported by king Hunneric; but not a murmur, not an objection against its authenticity was heard, or is recorded. And we have authentic evidence, not only that it was quoted by these bishops, but that it was before their eyes, in the version in general use in the western churches.* And what deserves our most particular attention, no Greek writer has recorded an objection or even a doubt against our verse. Let no man say, the members of the Greek church had never seen it—never heard of it. They *did see* it, they *did hear* it. If in no other way, and on no other page, they had heard of the African bishops quoting it publickly before king Hunneric, when called, at the peril of their lives, to defend the faith against Arianism. They *saw* it—they *heard* of it—they *knew* it on the pages of the version of the Latin church. No man in the sober use of his reason can say, that in this perfect publicity of our text in the western churches, it could be unknown to a minister, or a writer, in the Greek church. To suppose them ignorant of it under these circumstances, is to suppose an absurdity, an utter impossibility. Now, is it possible that any man can persuade himself that this verse could have been interpolated without the knowledge of the Greeks? Is it supposable that a Greek scholium, or a Latin scholium, could have crept in, and become the seventh verse, without resistance on the part of the faithful? It stood clearly before their eyes. It was quoted before them, at a time when the report of the proceedings of the African churches and bishops rang, not only over the plains of Africa, and over the hills and vales of Greece, but over all the east, and over all the west. The whole Christian world heard and knew that our text was quoted at that time. Now, no historian, no polemic, no practical expositor, Greek or Latin, has recorded one murmur, one doubt, one suspicion against this verse. We

* See No. III. in the Christian Advocate for Nov. 1824. And also Nolan's Inquiry, p. 545, &c.

* See Burgess, p. x. 42. 46. 80. 81.

all know how the Greeks remonstrated, and fiercely contended with the Latin church, against her insertion of one word ("*filioque*") in the Latin copy of the Nicene creed. Long and severe was this war, about the insertion of "*filioque*" into their creed. Now, is it supposable that they would have kept silence, and not merely have allowed the insertion, but the interpolation of a whole sentence, and that not into a *creed*, but into the *page of God's holy book!* Or is it supposable that the fact of the Latin version containing our text, would be less known than the fact of the Latin Church having the Nicene creed with "*filioque*" in it? I earnestly profess, Mr. Editor, that I cannot conceive how all this silence, and consequent approbation on the part of the Greeks, as well as of Latins, and of hereticks, as well as of orthodox, can be accounted for, on any other supposition whatsoever than this—that our verse was before the fathers and writers of both churches, and that it was sustained by such unquestioned and unquestionable evidence, that every scruple was removed, and that its authenticity was acknowledged by all, with the most perfect confidence. To deny this, would be to bring up a greater difficulty than—I do not say *one*—but *all* the difficulties presented against our verse by our opponents.

Here, then, is a point which, I humbly presume, must be considered as clearly gained. And we hold it up, again and again, to the view of the church. From the days of St. John to Erasmus, no one single doubt, or objection, or even suspicion existed, or is recorded against our verse. It was, as we shall presently see in the progress of our discussion, well known; it was frequently quoted—it was often alluded to—it was in the Bible universally current in the western churches. Nothing can be opposed to this, from the fourth to the ninth century, but *four defective MSS.*—not to say with Nolan—*four mutilated MSS.* At length the verse gained a currency—not in the western churches; it never ceased to have a currency there. We have two distinct testimonies of this; the Latin version, long current in Africa, before Jerome's version, and next to that Jerome's version; these—and they are two distinct witnesses—these declare decisively that our verse was always in currency in the western churches.* But it gained a currency in other parts of the church, where the corruptions, or oversight, (to say the least) of transcribers, had for a season withdrawn it from the eyes of many. And, at last, in the circling ages of time, it took its own proper place silently, firmly, publickly, and immovably. As a noble and venerable prince, unhappily excluded, in some dark hour of trouble, from his own dwelling place, by some shameful jealousy, or by some foul conspiracy; he at last is brought back; he comes in; the whole of the guilty rise up before him; all recognise his rights—not a tongue utters discontent; he sits down in his place and power, and all do him homage—in silence—with a returning sense of duty and propriety. Even so our verse took its place, in those manuscripts and versions from which it had lost its place for a season. It took its place where the hand of John had placed it. And none stirred an objection till Erasmus, in the year 1516, ventured to leave it out of his printed edition of the New Testament. And let critics name any other subject of criticism, which brings in its defence such another strength of *negative external evidence*, as this verse does, feebly as we have here stated its outlines.

3d. We have *positive external evidence* in favour of our text. We shall collect in detail quotations of our text, by different authors and churches; beginning, not at the earliest periods (as Burgess does), but with the latest testimonies, and so trace it back towards the apostolical times.

It is admitted by all, as far as I

* See Bengel, and Bentley, and Burgess's views on this. Burg. Vind. p. 7.

can discover, that our verse was generally received in the sixteenth century, by the most learned criticks, by evangelical churches and universities. The industrious Kettner, of the Lutheran church, gave a full and very interesting sketch of its gradual and general reception in the churches of all Europe.*

In the early part of the sixteenth century appeared the celebrated Polyglott of Ximenes. It was printed off in the year 1517, but owing, I presume, to the lamented death of the Cardinal Ximenes, it was not published until 1522.† Upwards of eight very valuable criticks were employed by the Cardinal on it, for more than twelve years. The fourth and last volume contains the New Testament, in the Greek text and Latin version only. Our verse is found in its place in this Polyglott. The gentlemen on the other side, have raised an objection against the authority of this Polyglott. They deny that Ximenes possessed any MSS. of value or antiquity. And they have even ventured to say that he had no MSS. to sustain him in inserting the text of the heavenly witness; that he caused it to be translated into Greek from the Latin version. In reply, we have to say, that the very learned scholars, together with Ximenes, tell us, that no pains nor expense was spared, to procure from all parts, the most correct and most ancient MSS. in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; and that the Greek exemplars were from the Vatican Library of Rome; and moreover, they bear ample testimony to the value of the MSS. which they use. And although this must be taken with limitations, in those infantine days of biblical criticism, we may, at least, boldly set up their statements against the proofless conjectures of their opponents.‡

To the other portion of the above charge, we have to reply, that Ximenes and his coadjutors used the Latin vulgate version—the only version which Catholicks acknowledge to possess any authority. But the Greek text of the heavenly witnesses, as it stands in the Complutum Polyglott, differs, in some particulars, from the vulgate. In the latter, our verse runs thus, as in other copies: "*hi tres unum sunt.*" The Complutum Polyglott has it thus—"οι τρεις εις το εν εισι."* We cannot, therefore, suppose the latter to be a translation from the former. Besides, the most learned of the criticks against us, have vindicated the Polyglott from this charge of some of their associates; for instance, Michaelis, and Eichorn, and Goez, and Marsh.†

In the warm contest between Stunica and Erasmus, the former reproached the latter for his impiously omitting the text of the heavenly witnesses. Erasmus hurled back the reproach, and defied Stunica to produce a single MS. containing the verse; and he added, however, that if any MS. of respectability could be produced, containing the text, he would insert it in his next edition—(and, as we showed in our last letter—the supplement to the No. IV. —he kept his word). Stunica could not produce the MS. required; they had totally disappeared. An unfavourable opinion was formed against Stunica and his associates, who composed the Polyglott. But the fate of these parchment MSS. has at last been detailed. Ximenes died very soon after the printing of the Polyglott. The same cause which retarded the publication for several years, produced ultimately, no doubt, the destruction of the parchments.—I mean the confusion and desolation produced in a Catholick priest's house by his death. For they possess none of the endearing, and affectionate, and attentive relations, which grow out of the married life. They have none

* Kettneri Hist. Dicti Johannei, &c. pp. 190—193.

† Butler's Hor. Bibl. vol. i. p. 90.

‡ See Butler's Hor. Bibl. vol. i. p. 105.

* As is evident from the *fac similes* in Burgess and in Horne, vol. iv.

† See Butler's Hor. Bibl. vol. i. pp. 92, 93. 105.

to care for them—none disinterested enough to take care of, or to preserve, their valuable papers and collections—as for instance, in this case of the Cardinal Ximenes, the ancient and valuable MSS. which had been used in the formation of the Polyglott of Complutum.

I have already stated, that they had been sold to a *rocket maker*, and had been used up by him in his vocation. But this must have been long after the death of Ximenes. It was in the year 1784, that Professor Moldenharverd discovered, at Alcala in Spain, that these MSS. had been disposed of, *thirty-five years ago*, to the rocket maker.* Now if our dates and information be correct, these valuable MSS. must have been swept away by the sons of the church, who, I believe, seize dutifully all that they can find in a deceased priest's house, for the benefit of the church. And they must have lain in the dark obscurity of their cells for upwards of 130 *years*, before they had been brought out into this unworthy market!

In the year 1519, the annotations of Stunica appeared, containing his own labours and those of his profound associates, in defence of the polyglott; and particularly of our verse. In 1520, Edward Lew (or Lee) attacked Erasmus. In 1527, Erasmus states, that he had then for the first time seen the Complutum Polyglott. He had yielded to the force of the evidence of the Codex Britannicus (now the Dublin MS.), and had put the verse into his third edition of 1522. And though he may have done it "*causa ne cui sit calumniandi;*" yet after seeing the Polyglott, and weighing the evidence of the Codex Britannicus, he continued to support the verse, in his fourth edition of 1527, and in his fifth of 1535.†

In the fifteenth, and fourteenth, and thirteenth centuries, the verse had become familiar to all the Greek writers. This will appear from the currency given to it in the Greek church, by the quotation of it in the acts of the council of the Lateran. The gentlemen on the other side do indeed gravely tell us, that the first Greek writers who quoted it, are Manuel Calecas, in the fourteenth century; and Bryennius in the fifteenth. This I presume is a gratuitous assertion. Or in the style of Professor Porson to Archdeacon Travis —"a mere invention of their own." They add, that when the 7th verse appeared, it presented itself in almost as many different shapes, as it did in its appearance among the Latins. To this we have one brief reply—that even admitting the statement of the thing as thus magnified—it is really *no evidence* against the authenticity of the verse. It exhibits a proof, indeed, of the carelessness of transcribers—but *no evidence* against the authenticity of the verse. A sufficient proof is drawn from the facts connected with the appearance of the 8th verse, in the existing copies. None of our opponents have questioned the authenticity of the 8th verse. And *they all know*, and Burgess *has clearly demonstrated* from quotations, that the 7th verse has actually *less multiformity* than the 8th verse!* Let them draw the conclusion.

The great council of the Lateran was held in the year 1215.—In the acts of this council our verse is distinctly quoted, together with the 8th verse: and "it is quoted in the Greek."† Among the members of this council were the patriarchs of Jerusalem, and of Constantinople; and also the proxies of the patriarchs of Alexandria, and of Antioch: in short, the representatives of the Eastern churches. They all concurred in the acts of the council. These acts were rendered into Greek, and published in the churches of the east. This proves very clearly that this verse had been current in the Greek churches previous to this. For its quotation and existence in the acts of the Lateran excited, no question

* Butler et Sup. p. 92.
† See Kettner. p. 190.

* See the proof at some length, in Burgess, p. 53.
† See Butler Hor. Bibl. vol. i. p. 398.

about its novelty; no doubt about its authenticity. On the supposition of the contrary, namely, that it was *not known to the Greek patriarchs, bishops, and writers*, what a tumult and furious onset must its novelty and intrusion have created among the Greeks, who had long stoutly fought against the Latins on many points; and especially for their inserting "*filioque*" in their Latin translation of the Nicene creed?*

I anticipate an objection, by noticing what some of the gentlemen in opposition have brought forward, to excite a doubt and suspicion, as to the whole of this evidence. It is this: after the 8th verse is quoted in the acts of the Lateran, it is added, "Καθως εν τισι χωδηξιν 'ευρισκεται:" "*as it is found in some codes.*" But this is set down *at the close of the 8th verse—not of the 7th verse—but of the 8th.* And hence every reader must perceive (and both Griesbach and Marsh candidly admit it), that the reference is made to the last clause of the 8th verse; which is not found in some of the Latin versions.†

The Liturgy of the Latin church rendered our verse familiar to every intelligent worshipper in the *eighth* century, and down to this day. For it is recited in the office for the administration of baptism; and in the office for Trinity Sabbath; and Easter.‡

Our verse is found also in the ancient Liturgies, and Confession of Faith of the Greek church. The Liturgies contain it, as a portion of the lesson to be read in the churches, on the thirty-fifth week of the year. And the Greek Confession of Faith, after the mentioning of *God and three persons*, quote our verse, as in the received text—"There are three that bear record in heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one."*

But this merits a fuller and more close investigation: I shall therefore resume it in my next paper—if the Lord permits.

I am, Mr. Editor, with affectionate regards, your's truly and faithfully,

W. C. Brownlee.

Basking Ridge, March, 1825.

* Kettneri Hist. Joh. Dict. p. 117. And Horne, vol. iv. p. 440.

† See Griesb. Nov. Test. edit. 2d. vol. ii. Append. p. 11. And also Marsh's Letters to Travis, p. 15.

‡ Kettneri, &c. p. 173. Horne, vol. iv. p. 445. See also Vossius de Bapt. Dissert. 16. And Selden de Synod. lib. ii. 138. And Cavei Hist. Liter. Append. p. 47.

From the London Christian Instructor.

LINES

ON READING THE STANZAS BY THE LATE LORD BYRON, ENTITLED, "ALL I ASK—ALL I WISH—IS, A TEAR."

Lately inserted in one of the Publick Papers.

(By Lord Byron.)

"All I ask—all I wish—is, a tear."

"When my soul wings her flight,
To the regions of night,
And my corse shall recline on its bier,
As ye pass by the tomb
Where my ashes consume,
O! moisten their dust with a tear.

"May no marble bestow
That splendour of wo,
Which the children of vanity rear,
No fiction of fame
To blazon my name,
All I ask—all I wish—is, a tear."

Thy corse will we lave
As it sinks to its grave,
With our tears we'll bedew the green sod,
And weep that no more
Thy spirit can soar,
Or seek the forgiveness of God.

That a star once so bright
Should sink into night,
And in darkness should quench all its rays;
Though it dazzled the world,
Should from heav'n be hurl'd,
In a moment extinguish'd its blaze;

This bids the tear flow,
Opes the fountains of wo;
It is set, and shall never arise!
We hoped it would shine,
Filled with lustre divine,
And chase the foul mists from its skies.

But, ah! thou art gone!
Like the dew of the morn,
The muses have wept round thy bier;
Now wrapp'd in thy shroud
Thou art hid from that crowd,
Whose sympathy *did* prompt a tear.

S. E.

* Horne, vol. iv. p. 445; and Dr. Smith's Miscell. p. 155.

Reviews.

THE HOLY BIBLE, CONTAINING THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS, ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORIZED VERSION, WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES, PRACTICAL OBSERVATIONS, AND COPIOUS REFERENCES. BY THOMAS SCOTT, RECTOR OF ASTON SANFORD, BUCKS. *First American stereotype quarto edition, in five volumes, from the London standard edition, with the Author's last corrections and improvements. Vol. I. Philadelphia. Published by William W. Woodward.*

Although Scott's Family Bible, or Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, is probably as well known to the American publick as any book whatever—the sacred volume without comment excepted—yet we feel constrained not to let pass the opportunity presented by the appearance of the first volume of this stereotype quarto edition, without saying something in relation to the Commentary in general, and of this edition of it in particular.

It is stated in the life of Dr. Scott, by his son, that this laborious work was commenced by his father Jan. 2d, 1788; and it is well known that from this period till the time of his death, which was April 16th, 1821, the improvement of this Commentary, in various successive editions, was, amidst all the author's other important engagements, the object which constantly occupied his most serious attention, and called forth his most vigorous efforts. The last London edition, stereotyped, was not entirely completed at the time of his death. Here then is a work, on which the mind and industry of Dr. Scott, for more than thirty-three years, were employed with unceasing assiduity. And how was he qualified—let us inquire—to undertake a commentary on the Scriptures? In the first place, he was eminently pious. Hence he was led to view the volume of God's revealed will with the most profound reverence; to search with the greatest care and caution for "the mind of the Spirit," from whom he believed that the whole had proceeded, in every passage and every word of this hallowed book; and to express that mind, when discovered, with as much simplicity and fidelity as possible. His piety, also, we have no hesitation to affirm, enabled him to *understand* the true meaning of innumerable passages in the Bible, which no unsanctified human mind ever did, or ever will, well and fully understand; and also to write the admirable practical observations, which accompany the several sections of his Commentary. In the next place, he was an example of laborious diligence and inflexible perseverance, in whatever of importance he undertook, such as the world has seldom seen. Hence he omitted no research, by which he believed his Commentary might be improved, nor spared any pains in altering, amending and transcribing, which he thought would contribute to the same end. As to his intellectual qualifications, he certainly was a man of a very vigorous and discriminating mind. The powers of imagination he appears never to have cultivated, nor much to have indulged; but in perspicacity, or a ready and clear perception of truth, and in soundness of judgment, he had few equals. His acquaintance with the original languages of the Holy Scriptures, although not to be compared, in point of critical nicety and extent of reading, with that of some distinguished proficients in Hebrew and Greek erudition, was, nevertheless, by no means superficial, or even moderate. He improved his knowledge of those languages much, after he became a commentator; and even made a good

progress in the Arabick, a kindred tongue of the Hebrew. He was therefore well qualified to examine for himself the original of every text in the Bible; and he left nothing unexamined, in regard to which there was doubt or controversy. He wrote his own language with facility, simplicity and neatness. He appears never to have *aimed* at either elegance or eloquence. Yet some of his practical reflections are truly eloquent,and powerfully impressive.

The following is Dr. Scott's own account of the manner in which he was led to become a commentator on the Bible.

"As I had read over the whole scripture repeatedly, I trust with constant prayer, and considering how almost every verse might be applied, as if I had been called to preach upon it; I had often thought that I should like to preach through the Bible: for instruction from every part crowded upon my mind, as I read and meditated from day to day. While I was in this frame of mind, a proposal was made to me to write notes on the scriptures, to be published, with the sacred text, in weekly numbers."

Beginning with such a knowledge, and such a love of the scriptures, as is here stated, what must have been the result of studying and commenting on them, and of comparing every passage with every other, in order to make his marginal references, for three and thirty years, by a man of such powers, qualifications and habits, as those of Dr. Scott? We deliberately believe that the probable result was, that when he died, he did not leave another man living, who possessed a knowledge of the sacred writings, which, take it for all in all, was as good and as accurate as that which he had acquired. In what is called Biblical criticism, considered in all its extent and connexions with other branches of knowledge, we doubt not, as we have already hinted, he left many superiors. But we question if he left one, better qualified to tell what is the *true import of the inspired text*—what are the truths and doctrines of the word of God. He often gives, in a few sentences, what must have cost him a laborious and extensive research to ascertain. Let any one that pleases make the experiment, of consulting all the laboured criticism on an obscure or controverted passage of scripture, to which he can find access; and after he has pored over the pages of some twenty folios, and examined the text in the original with all the helps he can find, then let him look into Scott's work, and acknowledge, as we think he commonly will, that he there finds, shortly and plainly stated, the most probable opinion or conjecture that can be formed on the passage. He will also generally find this opinion or conjecture expressed in a manner that is truly the author's own; for Scott was remarkable for thinking for himself, and for delivering his sentiments in his own language—always modestly and humbly, but yet clearly and explicitly.

That a work of this character and extent should have become so popular and so extensively known, as to require one edition to succeed another, both in Britain and the United States, so fast and with such certainty, that the ordinary method of printing might be safely and profitably exchanged for stereotype impressions, is at once a singular and a delightful fact. It shows that although the readers of bad, or vain, or worthless books, are very numerous, the readers of good ones are also not a few. Still, there are many families well able to purchase Scott's Commentary, that do not as yet possess it. Some of our readers may be of this description; and to such, it is our main object in this article most earnestly to recommend the securing of this invaluable treasure of doctrinal and practical Theology, without further delay. Here they will find every text of the volume of inspired truth, ably and faithfully expounded, and judiciously and powerfully applied to practice—brought home with fidelity, and ten-

derness, and discrimination, to the conscience and the heart. Who can tell the advantage to a Christian family, of having such a repository always at hand; to which resort may be had to solve all difficulties in reading the scriptures; to prove the truth or falsehood of what they may elsewhere read or hear; to resolve cases of conscience, which may arise in their own minds or in those of others; to instruct their families daily, by reading the portions marked for the purpose; and to be a source of the richest entertainment, instruction and consolation, when the world can no longer please or satisfy the mind. It does appear to us, that where these volumes cannot be purchased without giving up all fugitive publications of whatever kind, they ought immediately to be resigned. For ourselves, although we think our work contains more doctrinal instruction than most of the flying sheets of the day, yet we say, cheerfully and unreservedly, give it up and purchase Scott, if you cannot purchase, and keep the Advocate too.

Those who are in possession of the former editions, have certainly the substance of what is contained in this. Yet the additions and corrections in this last edition are not a few, and if we had not otherwise occupied our space, we should have stated them in detail. We cannot, however, advise those who with difficulty obtained the edition which preceded the present, or indeed any of the late editions, to purchase what is now offered. We may, with great propriety, repeat here the words of Dr. Johnson, in the advertisement prefixed to the last edition of his large dictionary—"The changes or additions bear a very small proportion to the whole. The critick will now have less to object, but the student who bought any of the former copies, need not repent; he will not, without nice collation, perceive how they differ, and usefulness seldom depends upon little things." We will, notwithstanding, suggest, that those who can afford it, will do well to give away a former copy to a poor friend, and to obtain this perfect one, in stereotype, for himself.

After all we have said, we are not to be understood as agreeing with Dr. Scott, in every jot and tittle of his Commentary. He was, in the matter of church order, a moderate but decided Episcopalian, and we are moderate but decided Presbyterians. We could also mention one or two passages of scripture, which relate to doctrine, to which he has given a construction, from which we feel constrained to dissent. But in regard to doctrines, we always dissent from him with the utmost diffidence; and we are glad to be able to say, that we agree with him in doctrinal points, more exactly than with any other author that we could name. He is just such a Calvinist as we thoroughly like; temperate and yet firm; steadfast in his own opinions, yet charitable toward those who differ from him in unessential matters; giving no quarter to "damnable heresies," yet treating those who have embraced them with compassion, and in every respect with Christian temper.

As to the particular volume, the coming forth of which has given occasion to these remarks, it is in the highest degree creditable to the enterprising publisher; who was, if we mistake not, the first printer in the United States, who more than twenty years ago, risked an American edition of Scott's Family Bible; and at that time the risk was considerable. The present work really deserves patronage, from those who wish to encourage the arts in our country, as well as from the friends of religion. The stereotype printing is in the very first style of execution, and for such an extended work (five large quarto volumes) must be very expensive. We trust, however, that the publisher will receive a full remuneration, in the success

of his enterprise. A superior engraving of the likeness of Dr. Scott which accompanied his life, and of the fac simile of his hand writing, fronts the title page of this volume.

The author of the following paper has not chosen to consider it as a Review; but it seems most properly to belong to this department of our work.—We have something to add at the close.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

"*Is Saul also among the Prophets?*"

Mr. Editor—In an age of boundless inquiry, and in a country where there are people of every shade of intellect and character to favour the pretensions of all sorts of pretenders; it is not surprising that folly sometimes exposes itself to contempt, where it might lie by undiscovered. Men who might, but for the irresistible vanity of being known, creep

"Along the cool sequestered vale of life"

with satisfaction to themselves and without any great harm to their neighbours, leave the lowly track allotted them by nature, and like the exhalations of a bog, rise from the bed of obscurity only to annoy a higher atmosphere.

These reflections have been suggested by the perusal of a little pamphlet which lately appeared in the south, under the title of "An Explanation of the Apocalypse." The advertisement that announced it was set out in terms so imposing, that in common with many others, I felt a strong impulse of curiosity to see this phenomenon. The author's name, it is true, rather discouraged the hope of entertainment or instruction from his work. But knowing that the largest diamond on earth was found in a field by a Russian peasant, I did not know whether something as strange had not happened in our own country. A hint, however, in the Christian Advocate for February, induced me to wait until last week, when this curious little pamphlet was sent me by a kind friend, and was read with all the attention due to its claims.

On finishing his labours, doubtless the writer felt

"Exegi monumentum, ære perennius!"

He saw in rising prospect a new column added to the temple of science, with his name engraved in living brass upon its capital.

It is not my design, Mr. Editor, to review his work. Permit me only to add two or three remarks, which may possibly be of some use to future commentators of the same class with our author. He proclaims himself the first discoverer of the meaning, or of any thing near the meaning, of the book of Revelation. To redeem so high a pledge, thrown as it was gratuitously into the lap of the publick, he ought to have been rich in talent, and careful in research. What his talents really are, and what his researches have been, any intelligent reader of his scraps will easily judge.

He endeavours to establish the fact, that Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, wrote the Apocalypse. His proofs are, that this Christian father lived in the times of Commodus Albinus, and others whom he *must* have known, and of course hated, and consequently that he wrote the Apocalypse, "from a principle of insatiable revenge," to brand those heathens with infamy. Here there is nothing but pure conjecture; and Irenæus is too well known to suffer in his Christian character by any new lights of the present day. Nor is there indeed a single point of proof in this case, any better established, or more admissible at the bar of common sense, than the *pretensions* of our author himself as an interpreter.

To show that this sacred book could not have been written by John, he affirms that its style is altogether different from that of the apostle in his other writings. The contrary is so evident, that no reader of the Greek Testament can fail

to see an identity of style, which, considering the sublime and prophetick character of the Revelation, is truly astonishing. With regard to the date of the church in Thyatira, let the writer refer, if he is able, to Schleusner on the name, and to the authorities there cited.

But his "Master Key" is the mystical number of the Beast. This he finds in the name "Decimus Clodius Albinus," written in Greek. Here, to break through the difficulties that opposed this step of his progress, he is compelled to throw that name into an oblique case, or to take the fatal alternative of honesty, and run up the number to 1116—450 too high. Now suppose some cavilling Christian should attempt a retaliation, by making out that number from another name. For example, I write ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΣΜΥΘ. But this name fairly written will, as before, run up the number by several hundreds too high. I accordingly take two or three slight liberties with the orthography, and it numbers accurately, thus:

Α Α Λ Ε Ξ Α Ν Δ Ρ Ο Ν ς
1, 30, 30, 5, 60, 1, 50, 4, 100, 70, 50, 6,
Σ Μ Ι Θ.
200, 40, 10, 9.
} 666.

There is the number of the beast! and within a fraction as fairly made out as it is by our new commentator. Therefore, 1. The church of Rome is not the wild beast of the Apocalypse; nor, 2. the French people; nor, 3. Bonaparte: but the aforesaid beast is neither more nor less than Alexander Smyth. Here is the same kind of reasoning with that of our author; except that his name, reduced to the Greek alphabet, and without any alteration, will really come nearer to the name of the Apocalyptick beast than that of Decimus Clodius Albinus by about one half.

Among other marks which, according to our author, fix the brand of Antichrist upon Albinus, is the amazing stomach which he is said to have possessed. He would devour 500 figs, 400 oysters, and an unknown quantity of other provisions at a breakfast. This ridiculous assertion is supported by only one writer, of whom we know hardly any thing—one Codrus. Yet it is used by our author to explain Rev. xiii. 2. "and his mouth as the mouth of a lion." But to digest such an exposition as this, a man surely must have at least as powerful a stomach as that of Albinus himself.

It is probable that the success of the pamphlet, will just about equal that of an attack made by the hand which wrote it, upon the publick character of one of our statesmen, a year or two since. For myself, I am well pleased that the cause of infidelity is so hard pushed, as to require the aid of such heads and such hands, to gather up its scattered ruins. On the whole, the commentary of the General has two defects, which have proved fatal to many a book and pamphlet—I mean its want of bulk and its want of truth. Brevity alone would not indeed consign it to oblivion. Its greatest danger arises from the other defect. For after the imposition is fairly exposed, there is little probability that a single copy of the work will reach its second year; unless it should be preserved in a collection of curious works of its own class. If such a collection should be attempted, I would respectfully suggest that the following articles should make a part of it—"The Travelling Millenarian, by Molleston Corrie; The Adventures of Baron Munchausen; The Prophecy of Nimrod Hughes; Searson's Poems; The Essays of Barkley Townsend; Jack the Giant Killer; and Tom Thumb." These works, with the Commentary, would make a snug octavo. The author might, if he pleased, add for an appendix, his own military annals, and this communication of your humble servant PHILEMON.

—

Editorial Remarks.—It is not always easy to determine in what way

the productions of infidels may best be treated. They sometimes exhibit so much weakness, ignorance, absurdity and falsehood, that they seem fit for nothing but silent contempt; or to serve as mementoes to pious Christians, to pity and pray for their miserable authors. Yet the weak and the ignorant, who have souls to be saved or lost as well as others, may, unless an antidote be provided, be destroyed by a mental poison that can have no operation on vigorous and well exercised minds. And infidels themselves will affect to triumph, when they have obtained no victory, if truth disdains to array herself before them. In one way or another, by reason or by ridicule, it seems best to repel every infidel attack on the facts and doctrines of divine revelation. Every such attack may, at least, afford an opportunity for making statements, or conveying information, which may be useful to those whose occupations or habits are unfavourable to research and reflection.

The singular pamphlet of Alexander Smyth, member of congress, which has given rise to the foregoing reflections, was probably intended by him, strange as it may appear, chiefly as a *catch-penny* performance.—Such, at least, has been the information which we have received, in a way that seems entitled to credit. Still, the author, no doubt, wished to make a parade of his erudition, and a display of his ingenuity, by accommodating the predictions of the Apocalypse to certain persons and events, of which history furnishes an account in the early periods of the Christian church. But we think it by no means probable that "the honourable member" himself had any belief at all, that the writer of the Apocalypse had really in view the men and things to which his prophecies are applied in this pamphlet. The pamphlet, we think, was simply intended to discover *learning* and *ingenuity*, to obtain a few dollars, to make the publick stare, to mislead blockheads, and as far as its author could, to vex serious Christians. Our correspondent has given him the treatment which he deserves, and that which he has received in other religious miscellanies.

Our purpose, in what we have further to say, is to make use of this opportunity to convey to our readers some account of Polycarp; a short view of the evidence on which the Revelation of St. John has been received as canonical scripture; and the opinions which wise and well informed men have delivered, in regard to the number 666—the number of the Apocalyptick beast. By doing this we hope to make the publication of Mr. Smyth the *occasion* of some good—Our limits, of course, will not admit of much detail.

Polycarp was the bishop, or presiding pastor, of the church of Smyrna; one of the seven Asiatick churches, to which the apostle John was divinely commanded to write, and to which he did write, what we find in the first three chapters of the book of his Revelation. All antiquity agrees that Polycarp was the disciple of John, and that he used to relate what he had heard from him and other apostles of the acts and sayings of Christ. There is little reason to doubt that Polycarp was the "angel of the church of Smyrna," at the very time that it was addressed by St. John. With this fact in view, and a knowledge of what eventually befel Polycarp, the address, Rev. ii. 8—11, may be read with peculiar interest. Polycarp, like his master John, lived to a very great age, probably not less than a hundred years; since at his martyrdom, when the Roman proconsul urged him with the promise of a release, to reproach Christ, he answered—"Eighty and six years have I served him, and he hath never wronged me, and how can I blaspheme my King, who hath saved

me." He suffered martyrdom about the middle of the second century, says Mosheim—in the year 167 says Milner—under the Roman emperor Marcus Antoninus, whose character was in many respects excellent and amiable; but whose proud stoicism rendered him a most cruel and unrelenting persecutor of the Christians, to his latest breath.

Polycarp was burnt at the stake, and met death with the most consummate fortitude and composure. Miracles had not then ceased in the church; and it is well attested that the flames, at first, made an arch over him, without doing him injury; and that a very fragrant perfume, very perceptible by many witnesses, issued from the fire. At length a soldier transfixed him with a sword; and his blood having extinguished the fire, it was rekindled, to prevent his friends from obtaining his body, which was now reduced to ashes. This account of his martyrdom, with many other circumstances attending it, was written immediately after his death, by the members of his mourning church at Smyrna, the witnesses of every fact they record, and sent abroad into sister churches, for their information and confirmation in the faith of the gospel. Scalliger's opinion of this letter, as given by Cave, was, that nothing in all antiquity, after the apostolick age, is more edifying and animating.

Eusebius states, that Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, represented him as having written a number of epistles, both to churches and individuals; and this, from his long life and great eminence in the church, is highly probable. The only production of his pen, however, that has come down to us, is his Epistle to the Philippians. This epistle is about as long as the first of Paul's to Timothy. It touches on a variety of topicks, all tending, however, to confirm them in the simplicity of gospel faith and obedience; and he particularly refers to the instructions and exhortations which they had received on the same subjects from the apostle Paul. It abounds with quotations from the scriptures; several from the Old Testament, and many from the New, especially from the epistles of Paul. Mr. Smyth thinks that it is conclusive evidence that John did not write the Book of Revelation because Polycarp, his disciple, has not quoted it in this epistle. But any one who reads the epistle of Polycarp, will find that from the beginning to the end of it, there was no occasion to quote the Apocalypse; no place indeed in which it could be quoted, unless it had been dragged in unnecessarily and improperly. And because a man does not quote what would be impertinent if quoted, is this a reason why it should be believed that he was ignorant of the writing not quoted, or that he rejected it as spurious? It may be a reason, for a man of such mind and habits as are those of Mr. Smyth, but certainly not for common minds. Polycarp, we have found on a careful perusal of this epistle, quotes from the gospels both of Matthew and Mark, but not a word from that of John: ergo, Polycarp was ignorant of John's gospel, or thought it spurious. This is conclusive reasoning, according to the dialectick of Mr. Smyth. Polycarp fortunately quotes the first epistle of John; otherwise, Mr. Smyth's canons of criticism would have left us none of the writings of the beloved apostle. General La Fayette has lately written a letter to the Agricultural Society of Pennsylvania, in which he has not said one word of President Washington's Farewell Address: ergo, as La Fayette was the pupil of Washington, and does not mention this address in his letter to the Agricultural Society, we have good reason to believe that address did not exist when La Fayette wrote his letter; but was afterwards forged by chief justice Marshall, the writer of

Washington's life. This will be good logick for the *Smythites* who shall live eighteen centuries hence. There is something so deeply base in charging Irenæus with forging the Apocalypse, when there is not one particle of evidence in all antiquity that such was the fact, or even that a suspicion of such a fact existed, that we shall leave it to our readers to give, if they can, the proper name to the slander.

We now proceed to offer a short view of the evidence, on which the Revelation of St. John has been received as canonical scripture. And here we have nothing to do but to make a quotation from the preface of the learned and candid *Moses Lowman*, prefixed to his "Paraphrase and Notes on the Revelation of St. John."

"The Book of the Revelation is, for very good reasons, received as one of the sacred books of the New Testament; the reasons for which are to be seen in many authors, and are represented, with great evidence and strength, by sir Isaac Newton, who observes, he does not find any other book of the New Testament, so strongly attested, or commented upon so early as this.

"Mr. Lardner has collected, with great care and faithfulness, the testimonies of the most early Christian writers, to the books of the New Testament, in a late excellent Treatise on the Credibility of the Gospel History. I shall just mention the testimony of the most eminent, to the authority of this book as a part of the Holy Scripture.

"Tertullian wrote about the year of Christ 200, and so somewhat above 100 years after the time in which St. John writ the Revelation. He observes, 'John, in his Apocalypse, is commanded to correct those who eat things sacrificed to idols, and commit fornication.' And again, 'We have churches, disciples of John; for though Marcion rejects his Revelation, the succession of bishops, traced to the original, will assure us, that John is the author of it.' It is no wonder Marcion should reject the Revelation, who rejected all the Old Testament, and of the New received only the gospel of St. Luke, and ten epistles of St. Paul, which also he had corrupted and altered.

"Somewhat before this, Clement of Alexandria quotes these Revelations as St. John's: 'As John says in the Revelation.' And he refers to them as the words of an apostle, or having the authority of apostolical writings.

"Yet earlier, Theophilus of Antioch, in a book of his against the heresy of Hermogenes, makes use of testimonies from John's Apocalypse.

"We have another witness of great character still nearer the times of St. John: Irenæus writ about A. D. 178, within 70 or 80 years of him. He expressly ascribes the Revelation to John, the disciple of the Lord. His testimony to this book, as Mr. Lardner observes, 'is so strong and full, that considering the age of Irenæus, it seems to put it beyond all question, that it is the work of St. John the Apostle and Evangelist.'

"Still nearer the times of St. John, Mileto, bishop of Sardis, one of the seven churches, writ a book on the Revelations of John. Some think it was an entire commentary; however that be, it will show he esteemed it a book of canonical authority.

"Justin Martyr, a person of eminent name, about the year of Christ 140, and so about 50 or 60 years after the writing this book, expressly calls it a prophecy, and ascribes it to John the apostle. 'A man from among us, says he, by name John, one of the apostles of Christ, in the Revelation made to him, has prophesied.' In fine,

"The church, nearest the times of writing this book, received it with so full consent, that in a very few years, as Dr. Mills observes, it was acknowledged and placed in the number of apostolical writings, not only by the churches of Asia, but by the neighbour churches of Syria and Samaria, by the more distant churches of Africa and Egypt, by Rome, and the other churches of Europe. Such reasons there are to receive this as one of the books of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament, that hardly any one book has more early, full, or authentick attestations given to it."

We shall likewise avail ourselves of Lowman's note, (for we know of nothing better) on the passage which relates to the Apocalyptick beast.

"The number six hundred sixty-six, is given as a number by which the name of the beast may be found out. The number is designed to have some sort of secrecy in it. The number itself is the same in all the places of units, tens, and hundreds, 666. This some have observed as a part of the mystery; but they should have observed, that though this is true in the English way of numeration, the original does not use three figures, but three different letters of the Greek alphabet χξϛ. Prophetick numbers will often require some skill in calculation, to find out, for instance, when days are to be taken for

years, or from what time any particular calculation is to take date.

"In the application of this number, some wisdom will be required; perhaps it will principally lie, in finding out after what manner the calculation is to be made. The exhortation, Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast, seems to intimate, that if men hit on the right way of counting or calculating, they will find the meaning of it; for it is the number of a man, a way in which men are used to number, says Mr. Waple, as, the measure of a man, is a measure in use among men, Rev. xxi. 17. And, to write with a man's pen, is to write with such a pen, and with such characters as are in use among men, Isaiah viii. 1.

"The great authority of Irenæus, who wrote so near the time, within less than an hundred years of the Revelation itself, and whose master, Polycarp, was a disciple of St. John, gave great weight to his opinion. Many have taken his manner of counting for granted, that it must be some name, the letters of which will make the number six hundred sixty-six. And many have been satisfied in the name he proposes to answer this number, which is the Greek word ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ.

"There had been more reason to follow Irenæus, had Irenæus himself been fully satisfied in his own interpretation.

"It is justly observed by the bishop of Meaux, that Irenæus does not propose his opinion with any authority, as an interpretation coming from St. John, but as a conjecture of his own. Further, Irenæus mentions two other names, as answering this number, besides Lateinos; Euanthas and Teitan. He expressly adds, that he is not positive in that matter; and gives this reason for it, if it had been necessary to know the name exactly, St. John would himself have revealed it more clearly. Nec asseverantes pronunciabimus, hoc eum nomen habiturum, scientes quoniam si oporteret manifeste presenti tempore præconari, nomen ejus, per ipsum utique editum fuisset, qui et Apocalypsim viderat, neque enim ante multum temporis visum est, sed pæne sub nostro seculo, ad finem Domitiani imperii. Thus expressly does Irenæus himself declare, that he delivers his opinion only as a conjecture of his own, and that he knew no particular interpretation of it from St. John.

"This number has been found out in so many other names, that this way of reckoning may seem at least very uncertain. The bishop of Meaux finds the number 666, in the word DIoCLes AVgVstVs; Grotius, in the word ΟΥΛΠΙΟΣ, Ulpius, the name of Trajan; Mr. Daubuz finds it in the Hebrew word רומית or Roman. And, besides many other names, F. Feuardentius mentions, in his annotations on this passage of Irenæus, he finds the number 666, in the name of Martin Lauter, which, he says, was the original way of spelling the name of Luther. He further finds the same number in the word MOAMETIS, as he chooses to spell the name of Mohammed. Many more instances may be seen in Calmet."

We have not room to give the whole note of Lowman on this passage. But we shall insert his own opinion, because to us it appears as good as any we have met with.

"May there not be another method of calculation, more natural and easy than either of the forementioned? A number that shall show the time of his becoming the beast, to use Mr. Waple's words? The learned Grotius seems to have had such a method of counting this number in his view, when he explains the words of the prophecy, by the time when idolatry shall revive, and recover strength. Qui sapit, notet tempus idololatriæ, animos et vires resumentis; ubi id evenerit, apparebit Christi præscientia.

"The number 666 may then be a number which counted from a given period in prophecy, may very nearly point out the time when this wild beast shall arise, or when the forty-two months are to begin; in which period, power was given him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them. Thus, the years in Daniel were to be computed from the going forth of the commandment, Dan. ix. 25. and the time of the coming of the Messiah was to be learned from that calculation.

"If we thus compute the number 666, from the time of this prophetick vision, we shall find it falls in exactly enough with the time wherein the papacy received the temporal power, and became the beast, or was constituted the last government of Rome, which is a principal character of the beast in this prophecy."

Those of our readers to whom we shall have communicated in this article very little that was not familiar to their minds before, will be good enough to recollect that our work is not intended for the learned only.—We presume that many who favour our labours may be informed and gratified, especially by our quotations from Lowman.

Literary and Philosophical Intelligence, etc.

Useful Invention.—Thursday evening much curiosity was excited about nine o'clock, in the Strand, by the appearance of a gentleman on horseback, from whose feet streams of light issued forth, and showed the pavement for several yards before and round the head of his horse as clearly as in day-time. The light proceeded from a set of lamps of his invention, one of which was fixed under each stirrup, and having three sides darkened, emitted in front a blaze which was prevented by the rider's feet from rising to dazzle his eyes, and fell on the foreground with such power as to make every hollow or impediment visible, and render it as safe to ride in the darkest night as in the brightest noon.—*Lond. paper.*

Publications for Children.—The little volumes entitled "Jane and her Teacher" and "George Wilson," are among the most interesting and useful of books for the young. They are addressed not only to the imagination, but to the heart. Piety is beautifully interwoven with incident throughout; so that one can scarcely arise from the perusal, without finding his feelings subdued to an acknowledgment of the loveliness of true religion.—As a reward to Sabbath School pupils, they will be found particularly appropriate,—especially "Jane and her Teacher;" and to all parents who know the value of good instruction, we can cheerfully recommend them as what may be made "good gifts to their children."—*Recorder and Telegraph.*

Preservation of Seeds.—The late Dr. Roxburgh, when in India, appears to have been in the habit of putting up the various seeds, which, among other things, he wished to send home to England, in an envelope of gum arabic: they were coated with a thick mucilage of gum, which hardened around them: and he was informed by Sir John Pringle, the President of the Royal Society, that the seeds had been received in a better state of preservation, particularly the mimosas, than he had ever seen the same kinds arrive from countries equally distant.

The Free School at Baltimore, established and supported by the late *John Oliver, Esq.* of that city, now affords instruction to about one hundred and eighty boys, and one hundred and sixty girls; and is, in all respects, in the best condition.

James Findlay, one of the oldest Gardeners in the neighbourhood of Philadelphia, has at this time, and has had for a few weeks past, two beds of Mushrooms growing in his cellar, which have every appearance of producing abundantly.—They appear of a much thicker consistence, as well as have a much finer flavour, than those found in old meadows and fields.

Unicorn.—Among the curiosities so liberally sent by Mr. Hodgson, assistant to the resident at Katmandoo, to the Asiatic Society of Calcutta, is a large spiral horn, said to belong to the Unicorn, and with it drawings of the animal, made by a Bhotea peasant. The drawings are stated to convey the true image of a living animal of the deer kind, out of the centre of whose head grows a horn, of the description transmitted. The animal is described as gregarious, graminivorous, and its flesh good to eat. Its name is *chiro;* its colour bright bay, and its dwelling place the plains of B'hote, beyond the Himalayah, and especially the woody tract of country situated a few days north-west of Digurche, known to the natives by the name of Chaugdung. The testimony of the poor Bhoteas, whom trade and religion bring down annually to Nepaul, appears to be uniform, respecting the existence of this animal, but they hesitate about procuring it, though urged by the promise of a liberal reward. They declare that the *chiro* is too large and fierce to be taken alive, or to fall under their simple weapons; but they sometimes find the horns, naturally shed by the living, or remaining after the decay of the dead animal. These horns are dedicated to their divinities, and the one obtained by Mr. Hodgson was brought to Katmandoo, to be suspended in the interior of the temple of Sumb'hoo Nat'h.

Captain *Weddel*, of the British Navy, whose account of his recent voyage towards the South Pole is in the press, after passing through an extensive barrier of ice islands, about fifty miles broad, commencing in the latitude of 68°, on the 20th February, 1823, actually reached the high latitude of *seventy-four degrees fifteen minutes south.* Here, with very clear weather, he was astonished to find that not a single piece of *field-ice*, and only four ice islands, were in sight, even as far as the eye could reach from the mast head. The state of the sea in this high southern latitude must excite wonder in the minds of geographical inquirers; who, since the unsuccessful attempt of Captain Cook to advance beyond the seventy-first degree, have considered these regions as impenetrable. The lateness of the season, and many concurrent circumstances, compelled Captain Weddel to take advantage of

a strong southerly wind to return homewards. He gave to this part of the ocean, the name of *The Sea of George the Fourth.* —*Nat. Gaz.*

Mr. Robert Wright, of this city, has undertaken to publish by subscription an extensive work, entitled AMERICAN NATURAL HISTORY, which is to be edited by Dr. John D. Godman. It will be illustrated by numerous engravings, from drawings by that eminent naturalist and artist, Mr. Lesueur, which have been made, in every practicable instance, from the living animal, or preserved specimens in the American Museum. As there is no complete work extant on this interesting subject, and as the means obtained for the execution of the present one are abundant and excellent, the whole performance is likely to be highly attractive and valuable. The first part, in three volumes octavo, will be ready for delivery by the first of September next. We have seen some of the engravings that warrant the most sanguine expectations, as to their general merit.—*Nat. Gaz.*

The African Colony.—Despatches have lately been received, at the Office of the American Colonization Society, and also at the Navy Department, from the Colony at Liberia, which are in the highest degree satisfactory. The Colony is under good government, and is rapidly improving.

Two houses of worship are building, the one by the Methodists, the other by the Baptists. There is a school for boys, another for girls; a third, an evening school, for adults.

The discovery of indigenous Coffee on that coast, samples of which have been forwarded to the United States, is full of auspicious promise to the interests of the Colony. Indigo bears full ten cuttings in the year, and its culture is extending.

The population of the Colony is about 380, of whom about three-fourths are grown persons. Three only have died within the last six months, and those from old age.

The relative value of oil and coal gases has been the theme of much debate and diversity of opinion abroad. A scientific writer in the Edinburgh Philosophical Journal, after detailing experiments made by himself, as to the illuminating power of coal gas, remarks—

"It cannot be doubted that the quality of carburetted hydrogen, obtained from pit-coal, must be greatly affected, not only by the nature of the coal from which it is procured, but in no small degree by the purifying processes to which it is subjected. It is to these circumstances that we must ascribe the very opposite statements respecting the comparative illuminating powers of coal gas, which are now pressed upon the public attention, with an anxiety which betrays more of the monopolizing jealousy of commerce, than of the spirit of a liberal and enlightened philosophy."

The last number of Tilloch's (London) Philosophical Magazine, contains a notice of the volume entitled *The Natural History of the Bible*, which was published in Boston in 1820, by its author, the Rev. Dr. Thaddeus Mason Harris, and reprinted in London a few months ago. The Philosophical Magazine says of it—

"Among the valuable contributions to science and literature, with which our American brethren are now enriching our language, we are happy to notice this useful volume. The want of such a work has been much felt in this country: we know not of any other book on the same plan. It is sufficiently full without being prolix; the valuable materials are arranged with a convenient method, and the author manifests a due discrimination, and has arrived at his own conclusions, on the best evidence which the subjects admit."

Mr. *Charles Pictet* died at Geneva, on Dec. 29th, aged 70 years. As an author, he has been distinguished by several valuable articles in the *Bibliotheque Britannique*, and some works on Agriculture and Politics. As an agriculturist, Switzerland and even France are indebted to him; for a more complete theory of *assolements*, for the introduction of the Flanders plough, and improvements in wool, by crossing the breed. As a citizen, he was active in the service of his country, in 1814 and 1815, when the Diet confided the interests of Switzerland to him, in some important negotiations. Mr. Dumont, his friend, has proposed to the Sovereign Council, to erect a monument over his tomb, with this inscription:—"Erected by the grateful Republic."

The celebrated Danish chemist, M. Oersted, shows, that of all the fruits which grow in Denmark, the apple is that which, together with a great quantity of sugar, produces the drink which approaches nearest to wine. Cherries, gooseberries, and other fruits, from which it has been tried to extract vinous drinks, are by no means proper for that purpose. He hopes, in the course of a few years, to be able to manufacture very good wine with the juice of the apple and sugar. The sap of the trunk of the birch, is of all vegetable substances that which furnishes the best means of imitating Champaigne, which is adulterated in London and Hamburg in the manufactories, with different sorts of berries, especially whortles.—*Bulletin Universel.*

Among the passengers who arrived at New York from Liverpool, in the ship Columbia, was Captain Franklin, of the Royal B. Navy, who has rendered himself so justly celebrated by his valuable discoveries and his almost unexampled suffering in an expedition which he conducted over land to the Polar Sea, in the years 1819, 20, 21, and 22.

It is understood that Captain Franklin is about to undertake a second expedition through Canada to the Polar Sea, with the hope of meeting or communicating with Captain Parry, who is now in the arctic regions for the purpose of finding a north-west passage, and making other geographical discoveries.

Indian Longevity.—"Within these last eight years," says the Canada Spectator, "there have died in the village of Coganawaga, ten Indians, each of them past an hundred years of age—Some days ago, the curate buried a woman aged 166. There is now living a squaw, who has her descendants to the fifth generation; in other words the child has now living, her mother, grandmother, grandmother's mother, and grandmother's grandmother."

The net expense of the Poor for the last year in the town of Salem, Mass. was only $64 85! This result has been produced by the town farm and the wise management of overseers, by which the earnings of the paupers have defrayed all the rest of their subsistence.

The Charleston S. C. Courier, among many other instances of the uncommon mildness of the past winter, mentions that an *apple* of the second growth, measuring four inches and a half in circumference, was plucked from a tree in Charleston about the middle of February.

The number of persons executed in London during the last year was only 11, being less than was ever known for the same period. In 1820, there were 43 executions. In the seven last years the total number was 176.

M. Laplace has in a course of publication, the *fifth* volume of his *Mecanique Celeste*.

Religious Intelligence.

ANTICHRIST AND HIS ALLIES COMBINED, TO OBSTRUCT THE DIFFUSION OF THE WORD OF GOD.

It would be a new thing under the sun, if revealed truth should be propagated without opposition. This is an occurrence not to be expected, till the promise shall be fulfilled, "that Satan shall be bound a thousand years." Events in providence highly favourable to the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures, and to the missionary cause, have taken place within the last five-and-twenty years. Opposition, as usual, has been made; but till lately with comparatively little violence, and with less success. But "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience," will not suffer his empire to be invaded and gradually wrested from him, without making all the resistance that he can. If permitted, he will move both earth and hell, to counteract the progress of the gospel; and to nothing will he be more directly and vehemently opposed, than to the wide circulation and general knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; because, when unaccompanied by note or comment, they contain "truth without any mixture of error"—truth which he well knows will subvert his kingdom, wherever it shall be received and reduced to practice. It is also a fact, however we may account for it, that the great adversary of souls has often been permitted to mar the progress of evangelical truth in its purity; and often when he has not succeeded in arresting its progress and its influence, he has still given its advocates much annoyance, in its defence and propagation; has rendered vigorous and persevering efforts necessary, and much suffering and many sacrifices unavoidable.

We have been led into these reflections by observing, for some time past, that a more envenomed opposition than usual has been made, in several instances, to evangelical mis-

sions; and particularly by the hostility which has been organized in Europe, prompted and headed by the Pope of Rome, to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures. It is generally known that the Roman Catholick priests of Ireland, in obedience to the mandate of his anti-christian Holiness, have been using all their influence to prevent the distribution of Bibles (even in translations made by papists themselves) among the people who compose their charges, and who constitute a very large majority of the population of the whole island. It is also pretty generally known, that the Grand Seignor has recently prohibited the sale of Bibles throughout his extensive dominions: but it is probably not generally known that this, too, has been done at the instance of the Pope. Yet, from evidence now before us, such clearly appears to be the fact. Nor has this pernicious influence of the Pope terminated even here. We do not know that he is formally a member of the Holy Alliance—He was hardly thought of importance enough to be taken in as a party, when that alliance was formed. But that he has great influence with the potentates that compose it, from his known friendship to all their principles and measures, there is no reason to doubt. Nor shall we be at all surprised, if before another year shall elapse, that alliance shall *openly* employ their united energies to stop the general diffusion of the word of God throughout their dominions, and elsewhere as much as shall be in their power. That this is at present their cordial desire, there is, we think, good reason to believe. The very truth is, that if the sacred volume be given to the populace of any country in their mother tongue and without note or comment, they will soon learn that all oppression and tyranny is contrary to the whole scope and spirit of God's revealed will; and therefore will not long remain easy under the dominion of their masters and the denial of their natural rights. It is a conviction of this truth that renders the slave holders of Demerara—and alas! those also of many other places—so hostile as they notoriously are, to any instruction of their slaves in the doctrines of the gospel. The spirit of the gospel, and unmerited slavery, in all its forms and degrees, are as opposite as light and darkness.

Since the publication of our last number, we have received from a valued correspondent in Europe—in what part of it, we think it improper now to say—the following communication; on which we place, for ourselves, the fullest reliance, and believe that our readers may safely do the same. Speaking of the circulation of the scriptures, he states—"In Russia, I lament to say, the good work is languishing, and apparently almost ready to expire. Henceforth no copies of the scriptures are to be distributed in that vast empire, not even amongst the Tartars and Mahomedans, but through the hands of the *clergy of the Greek church:* and the Persian translation, made at St. Petersburgh, is suppressed. The Pope, the Jesuits, and the powers of darkness, are most actively working, in ways almost inconceivable; even so far as to have moved the Turkish Divan, to issue a firman against the circulation of the scriptures. This was especially the act of his Holiness. But it is wonderful how these crooked measures are, in many instances, counteracted. Let us still rest confident, that "greater is He who is for us, than all they who are against us." The work is the Lord's, and we may "look to the everlasting hills from whence cometh our help."

Papoff, the late valuable secretary of the Russian Bible Society, is under a criminal prosecution, for translating a book of Gossner's, in which the perpetual virginity of Mary is combated—as are two others. The Emperor Alexander, it is said, is really shackled by the noblesse and the clergy of the Greek church; who feel that the flood of light which has been let in by the circulation of the scriptures, may prejudice them. Prince Gallitzin has been *obliged* to resign, as minister of religion, and to give

way to others.—Could not your periodicals do much good, by noticing what is going forward (particularly in Russia) frequently and powerfully, so as to excite publick attention?"

It is our purpose, according to the suggestion of our correspondent, to use our best efforts, to awaken the serious attention of the religious publick in the United States, to the conflict which has begun, and which will probably be severe, between the friends and foes of Bible societies and of missionary enterprises. We have no doubt that in this we shall have the ready and cordial co-operation of all the conductors of religious miscellanies in our country, who favour the cause of evangelical truth and piety.

Is it asked—what can be done, more than is now doing? We answer—more, much more zeal and activity, may be manifested in the cause of the Bible and of missions, by carrying into execution existing plans and measures, with greater vigour and efficiency—Let this then be done. But we do think that some *new* measures ought to be taken, by the friends of the Bible cause and of missionary efforts; measures calculated to promote a friendly intercourse among all the religious denominations concerned, without violating any of the forms or peculiarities of the several parties; measures, in a word, which shall present to the anti-christian host, the host of all the faithful living in our country, as arrayed against them—arrayed in a firm united phalanx; determined, under the "captain of their salvation," to oppose, by a combined effort, all his enemies, however numerous or powerful; determined, with gospel arms and a gospel spirit, to "contend earnestly for the truth once delivered to the saints," and never to abate the struggle, till "all the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." When the enemies of God and his holy word unite, let not their friends and advocates be divided, or act without concert. Finally—Every Christian can pray. Let him pray that God may turn the counsels of his enemies into foolishness; and turn their hearts, "as the rivers of water are turned," from hating and opposing his cause, to love and promote it. Let earnest prayer be made, both in private and in publick, that the Lord may "arise and plead his *own cause*." It must, at last, be the prevalence of "fervent and effectual prayer," that will stop the progress of error, delusion, and every wicked work, and render the cause and truth of God triumphant over all opposition, and throughout the habitable earth.

SANDWICH ISLANDS.

The Rev. Mr. Ellis, a British missionary, who went from the Otaheitan to the Sandwich islands, and was there employed for some time, in concert with the American missionaries, arrived about two weeks since, with his family, at New Bedford, in the ship Russell. We have understood that this voyage has been taken for the recovery of the health of Mrs. Ellis, which was in such a declining state as to render a departure from Oahu indispensable to the preservation of her life. We have seen it stated in one of the publick prints, that Mr. E. was to proceed immediately for Boston—we suppose to meet the prudential committee of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. We have some hope of seeing him in Philadelphia, before he leaves our country. By the vessel in which he came, two letters from Betsy Stockton have been received, from which we give the subjoined extracts. The dates of these letters are a few days more recent than any which we have seen published. But they contain little in regard to the general state of the missions—the writer being apprized that Mr. Ellis would, on that subject, com-

municate the best and fullest information.

—

Lahaina, Maui, Sept. 15, 1824.

Rev. and dear Sir—By the Tamahamaha I received your kind letter, and found it truly refreshing. At the time I received it, I was at Oahu with Mr. and Mrs. Stewart. We went there in April, and did not return until August.

What I shall say to you respecting my journal I know not. Perhaps I am guilty of neglect—and perhaps not. During the first six months after we came here, I was pretty much engaged with the domestick cares of our family; and had but little time to write and but little matter to write about. I however wrote when I could, although I knew but little personally of the general state of the mission; and was fully aware that Mr. Stewart would send you constant and full accounts of it, which would be much more interesting than any thing I could say. With this in view, I have disobeyed one of your parting commands; but let me entreat you not to attribute it to ingratitude, or to the want of any proper feelings. * * * * * * * * *
In your last letter you tell me "to keep up my spirits." I wish it was in my power to say that I have always done so; but here I fear I must plead guilty. My spirits often sink very low; and that this is criminal I do not pretend to deny. I knew that the work in which I was to be engaged was great and glorious, and that it demanded all my faculties of body and mind in its performance. Still I am of the opinion that Christians at home, surrounded by all the ordinances of the gospel, and by their Christian friends at all times accessible to them, cannot judge what are the heaviest trials a missionary is called to bear. I have found them to consist, not in the relinquishment of those outward comforts which I once enjoyed, so much as in the want of spiritual food and Christian converse. This want I often feel very keenly. When in my native land, my Christian privileges constituted much of my happiness; and now, the privilege of mourning their loss will surely not be denied me. But though sorrowful, yet I rejoice. The missionary's sorrows and the missionary's joys are mine.—The missionary's grave, and perhaps the missionary's heaven, will also be mine. * * * * *
Mr. Ellis has always been kind to me, and I regret his loss very much. But it is the Lord's doing, and we will be still. I hope he will visit Philadelphia, that you may have an opportunity of seeing him. You will, I think, find in him both the Christian and the gentleman. Mr. Stewart intends giving him letters to you.

I have been looking over my journal and find but little that is fit to send you, and that little I shall probably not be able to send at this time; as I expect to embark for Oahu to-morrow, or the day after, with Mr. Richards, who is going to take one of Mr Ellis's children home, that has been living with us. My business there is to render Mrs. Ellis what assistance I can, previous to her embarkation; and then to return to Lahaina as soon as possible. The vessel in which we expect to sail has not yet arrived; and if in my power I will yet collect my scattered papers and send them to you.*—But if not by the present, by the next opportunity, which I expect will be soon.

Please to give my love to all the family. I am looking anxiously for Commodore Hull; and expect to feast on the letters that he will bring me. The health of our family is but *so, so*. Mr. Stewart has not been well since we returned from Oahu. The most of the time he does not enjoy good health. Little Charles grows finely, and is a pleasant boy. Mr. Bishop and Mr. Goodrich have each buried a child on these heathen shores. I wish to finish a letter if possible to Mr. J——, before the ship sails. Please to excuse all my blunders, and consider me still your humble servant,

BETSY STOCKTON.

—

The following is the letter referred to above.

Lahaina, Maui, Sept. 16, 1824.

Dear Sir,—I should think myself highly criminal, if I did not embrace the first opportunity to tender you my warmest gratitude for your kindness. I know you want no fine speeches nor apologies. You are fully aware that, however widely separated from you, still the home and friends of my youth hold their place in my heart, and that time and distance only tend to endear them the more to me. The reflection that if I am faithful, we shall soon meet where sin and sorrow are known no more, is a support to me under every trial. I do not say that this reflection has its due influence at all times on my mind; for I am often dejected in this land of darkness. If I walk abroad, there is little but sin and misery presented to my view; or if I look within, there is a still more appalling sight: and when I

---

* We have not yet received these papers, nor any communication from Mr. Stewart.

miss the *alanui pololе*,* I have not so many friends to direct me right as I once had. * * * *

You wish to hear of *shells, lizards*, and *stones*, &c. &c.; and I regret that it is not in my power to send you more of them. I have seen many things which I should have liked to send you, but have been unable to purchase them. Not long since a boy brought one of his former gods to sell, which was about a yard and a half long, carved with much ingenuity, and painted black. The value of the article he wanted was about thirty cents, which I was unable to give, as Mr. Stewart was not at home at the time. All that I have collected I sent some time since by a Nantucket whaleman—the third mate of which was a coloured man, who promised to present them to you himself if nothing prevented; and if prevented, to see them safely shipped for Philadelphia. Perhaps the most curious thing among them is some lava, taken from the volcano on Hawaii. In many respects it is said to exceed any in the known world.

A very able work will soon appear, written by Mr. Ellis, who was one of the deputation sent lately to explore these islands; in which a description of the volcano, accompanied with a drawing, will be seen. At the same time you will probably have the Hawaiian Convert, or the Life of Keopuolani, the late queen, who was our best and most lamented friend. She was perhaps the first true convert to the Christian faith, and at the same time the greatest chief on these islands—the mother of the present king, prince, and princess. But to the point—Handsome shells are not very abundant here. Coral we have in great quantities, and some of the specimens are very beautiful—I hope to let you see them before long. Lizards we have by the thousand, and of almost every colour—some with long tails, and some with short ones. They often fall on our table, and run over our beds. The natives are in general afraid of them, for during the *tabu* system, they were worshipped as gods. I am one of their avowed enemies, and murder them whenever I can. Snakes and toads we have none; —lice and fleas of a superior quality and quantity; cockroaches and ants without number—and all these belong to our household.

While I was at Oahu, I visited the Salt Lake, which is about a mile and a half in circumference, and nearly surrounded with fresh water. The orifice from which the salt water issues is not more than an inch in diameter. As we approached it, it had the appearance of a lake frozen over, and then covered with snow. The salt crystallizes at the bottom. I went in some distance, and broke off some specimens, with the stone on which it had crystallized, to send you. Mr. E. is of the opinion they cannot be sent; but I think I shall try by the first good opportunity. * * * * * *

Give my love to cousin Flora, and thank her for the information she gave me. Tell her to write and let me know how all my relations are, and how many of them have turned their feet into the narrow path of life and peace. I have now a fine school of the *Makeainana*, or lower class of people, the first I believe that has ever been established. * * * * *

* We cannot translate these words—They seem to denote an *unerring guide*.

The Treasurer of the Trustees of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church acknowledges the receipt of the following sums for their Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. during the month of March last, viz.

Of the Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, the annual collection for the Contingent Fund	$57 13
Of Solomon Allen, Esq. his second payment on account of his subscription for the Philadelphia Synod's Professorship	1000 00
Of Rev. Reuben Post, his third instalment in full of his subscription for the Oriental and Biblical Literature Professorship	50 00
Of Rev. Alexander Campbell, a member of the Senior Class of 1824, per Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, for the same Professorship	18 50
Of Rev. Samuel Lawrence, per Alexander Henry, Esq. on account of his subscription for the scholarship to be endowed by the Senior Class of 1823	15 00
Of John Shaw, Esq. in full of the subscription of Mrs. Hugh Wilson for the Harmony Scholarship	50 00
Total	$1190 63

View of Publick Affairs.

EUROPE.

GREAT BRITAIN.—The British parliament was opened on the 3d of February. It is stated that the King's health did not permit him to open it in person; and that therefore the royal speech was delivered by the lords commissioners appointed for the purpose. His majesty congratulates parliament on the unparalleled prosperity of the nation; states that Ireland participates in this prosperity—denounces the Catholick associations, and recommends a continued attention to the whole state of Ireland; mentions the Burmese war with regret, but anticipates a successful termination; tells his faithful Commons that some augmentation of the military establishment is necessary, but that it can be made without any increase of the publick burdens, and even with a reduction of them; announces the existence and probable continuance of peaceful dispositions among all the European powers, and that his friendly interference to reconcile Russia and the Ottoman Porte, has been successful; informs them that papers will be laid before them relative to arrangements for improving commercial intercourse with Denmark and Hanover, to a treaty with Sweden for the suppression of the slave trade, to difficulties which have arisen about the slave trade in negotiating with the United States, and to commercial treaties with the late Spanish colonies in America. The speech then concludes with his majesty's congratulations on the improvement in agriculture, the benefit resulting from the late removal of commercial restrictions, and with recommending the still farther removal of such restrictions. A warm debate took place in parliament, on that part of the King's speech which denounces the Catholick associations of Ireland—Measures however will be taken to suppress them. We were gratified to find that Mr. Canning, in a speech delivered by him in regard to the consequences in Europe of recognizing the independence of the South American States, confirms our opinion, expressed in our last number, that there will be much growling, but no fighting. Britain certainly enjoys at this time an unusual tide of worldly prosperity, and is even incumbered by her superfluity of wealth as a nation; while yet the number of her poor is great, and even increasing.

FRANCE.—No news of much general interest have been received from France, during the past month. Some discussions have been had, relative to the indemnification of the emigrants. The measure gratifies many, and irritates others. The King has lately sent a considerable donation to the President of the Protestant Consistory of Paris, for the relief of poor Protestants. La Fayette is vituperated by the ministerial journals of Paris, as ardently as he is caressed in the United States—By both he is honoured. The independence of Hayti is not yet proclaimed.

SPAIN and PORTUGAL.—As far as we know, the state of these kingdoms, if kingdoms they can be reckoned, remains much the same as it has been for some time past. We believe that Portugal is trying to get a price from Don Pedro, the emperor of the Brazils, for a declaration of the independence of his empire; and it is probable that something will be obtained. Willing or not willing, Spain and Portugal must give up all their American colonies.

THE POPE, the HOLY ALLIANCE, and the OTTOMAN PORTE—are all combined, as may be seen in our article of religious intelligence, to stop the circulation of the Holy Scriptures. We cannot deny that the parties seem to be entirely worthy each of the other; but combine as they may, they will ultimately find that they contend with a fearful disparity, when they set themselves to oppose Him whose word *will* have "a free course, run and be glorified." We have heard little new in the month past in relation to these anti-christian powers, beyond what we have stated. The death of the old king of Naples has been announced.

GREECE.—The affairs of the Greeks remain prosperous. It appears that their unhappy civil dissentions, which for a time wore a threatening aspect, have been happily terminated; and that they are likely now to establish free institutions, without opposition or discord. The Turkish garrison at Patras was, at the last accounts, apparently on the point of capitulating.

ASIA.

We have nothing new to report from this quarter of the world, except the success of the British arms, in their war with the Burmese. Several bloody conflicts have

taken place, but victory has uniformly declared in favour of the British. The Burmans are brave, but they cannot contend with any advantage against the military tacticks and discipline of Europe. We expect, however, there will be a sanguinary conflict in their defence of the capital of their empire.

AFRICA.

The enterprising travellers from Britain are endeavouring, with unabated vigour, to explore the interior of this vast continent. We have been very sensibly affected with the accounts we have lately seen of the sale of Christian slaves at Tunis. It is the opprobrium of all Christendom that the Barbary states are suffered to carry on this abominable traffick. Yet European vessels are principally employed in bringing the slaves from Greece to this detestable market. No less than eighty-six have lately been brought to Tunis in this manner. They were a part of the unhappy inhabitants of Scio, who could not be disposed of in the glutted markets of Turkey, but commanded a high price at Tunis. The subject is too shocking and disgusting to dwell on.

AMERICA.

Our southern neighbours, since the victories of Bolivar in Peru, have been freed from the confusion and distress of war; and are all of them, we believe, making more or less progress in forming and settling their civil institutions. An active Christian missionary has lately completed a translation of the New Testament into the *Peruvian tongue*, which it is expected will speedily be published at Lima. We hope that South America may be well replenished with Bibles, before the pestilential influence of the Pope shall have reached thither, to prevent their circulation.

United States.—Since the publication of our last number, a President of the United States has retired from office, and his successor has been inaugurated. The administration of President Monroe was, on the whole, eminently happy and successful. He has deserved well of his country, for his long, faithful, and important services; and it has been with regret that we have seen it stated, that in going into the shade of retirement, he goes to bankruptcy and poverty. We hope that publick justice will permit the allowance of all his accounts, which he submitted to a committee of Congress. We follow him with our prayers, that whatever may be his worldly circumstances, he may in his retirement be preparing for a richer inheritance and higher honours, than any which this world can confer.—The inaugural address of President Adams, was every thing that we could wish it. We do not see in what respect it could have been better. It was dignified, conciliatory, intelligent, comprehensive without being prolix, chaste in composition, and concluding admirably, with a recognition of his entire dependance on God, expressed in the very language of inspiration. His cabinet consists of Mr. Clay of Kentucky, Secretary of State; Mr. Rush of Pennsylvania, (now in London or on his return) Secretary of the Treasury; Mr. Barbour of Virginia, Secretary of War; Mr. Southard of New Jersey, Secretary of the Navy, and Mr. Wirt of Virginia, Attorney General—Mr. Clay has addressed a very able letter to his former constituents in Kentucky, explanatory of his views and motives in voting for Mr. Adams as President. Among many other topicks he notices his unhappy card. He admits that "he ought not to have put in it the last paragraph," which contains a virtual challenge to a duel; and declares also, that "no man holds in deeper abhorrence" than he, the practice of duelling. Yet (alas! for the inconsistency,) he might "by inevitable circumstances" still be "forced" to fight a duel—"It is an affair of feeling, about which we cannot, although we should reason. Its true corrective will be found when all shall unite, as all ought to unite, in its unqualified proscription." We must declare that we consider this apology even worse than the offence. Yet it is the usual apology—much like that which Hamilton and Decatur offered. But offer it whoever may, it is both absurd and wicked. When will "all unite" in an "unqualified proscription" of duelling, while men in eminent stations practise it?—Never—They are the very men who prolong the evil, and the chief guilt of it lies at their door. And can any thing be more absurd than to affirm that we *cannot* reason, about a matter in regard to which we *ought* to reason? This is all but a contradiction in terms. If we *cannot* reason, we are under no *obligation* to reason.—We are *insane*, and reason is out of the question. Such talk, on any other topick, would subject a man to ridicule and scorn—We think our country owes its thanks to Commodore Rodgers, who, in opposition to this tide of fashionable but destructive sentiment, has issued orders to all the officers under his command, strictly forbidding duelling on any occasion; declaring that he will punish it rigorously, and

denouncing the whole practice in unqualified terms. This is consistent, manly, and noble. A few such examples as this, in men of high military rank and of tried bravery, would have the most happy effect. We rejoice that our President has never been a duellist, and if under his administration, and by his influence, the practice should be banished from our country, it would form for him the richest and brightest jewel in his crown of glory. That this event may be realized, and that an administration, happily commenced, may be prosperous throughout, should be the subject of prayer, with all who love their country and their God.

To Subscribers and Correspondents.

The Editor of the Christian Advocate, and his son who conducts all its mercantile concerns, have removed to No. 150, Pine-street, Philadelphia. This notice is given, that all who make communications for the Advocate, whether literary, or pecuniary, or requesting to become subscribers, or relinquishing their subscriptions, may know in what manner to direct their letters, parcels, or friends.

It is respectfully suggested to distant subscribers, who have not yet paid for the Christian Advocate of last year—and the number of these is considerable—that they will have a favourable opportunity to make their remittances, by the clergy and laity of the Presbyterian church, who shall come to Philadelphia as members of the next General Assembly.—Payments in advance may be forwarded in the same manner.

We have received a note, not written we think with the best temper, with the signature of *A Subscriber*, complaining grievously that we have neither published nor invited a memoir of a deceased brother clergyman. We can assure the writer of the note that we loved and honoured that brother while he lived, and have very sincerely lamented his death; and that the unworthy motives, which he insinuates might influence us in not inviting a memoir, are strangers to our bosom.—We wonder they should ever have occurred to the mind of *A Subscriber*. The sole cause of what is deemed our neglect was—the time that had elapsed since the decease of the lamented brother, rendered it, we supposed, useless to invite an obituary article in regard to him. But if *A Subscriber*, or any other individual, will send us a well written article of this kind, it shall still have a ready insertion. It is, in most cases, utterly impracticable for the editor of a miscellany to prepare such memoirs himself. They require a knowledge of facts and dates, which he cannot often possess or obtain. We exceedingly wish that the Christian Advocate should be a repository for memorials of eminent Christians. No articles are more acceptable or useful. But while they should not be prolix, they ought to contain more than a meagre statement of name, birth, and burial. It is long since Mr. Addison justly remarked, in a number of the Spectator, that it is a tacit satire on the deceased, to record on his monumental stone, nothing more than that he *lived* and—*died*. We have refused but one obituary article, and that merely because we thought it not worthy of its subject.

There is no part of the duty incumbent on the editors of religious miscellanies more unpleasant, than to refuse to publish communications well intended, and on important subjects, but not written with the ability which the subjects demand. This unwelcome duty we shall have to perform, in regard to a series of papers proposed to be sent us on the vastly important subject of missions; unless on seeing a second number, we should find it more nearly approximating what it ought to be, than we have found the first which we have already received.

☞ Since the extracts of letters from Betsy Stockton were in type, we have received a second Journal of the Rev. Mr. Stewart, of which we shall give some interesting parts in our next number.